

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



MS
956(F)
#27

SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF THE SCRIPTURES
IN THE
HISTORICAL DRAMAS

by

C. A. Sawtell, B. A.

Department of English

University of Alberta

A Thesis Submitted to the

University of Alberta

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts

Under the Direction of Professor Denis R. Godfrey

Edmonton, Alberta

June 12, 1956

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The undersigned hereby certify that they have
read, and recommend to the School of Graduate
Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled
Shakespeare's Use of the Scriptures in His His-
torical Dramas, submitted by C. A. Sawtell, B.A.,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

In the course of this thesis, Shakespeare's Use of the Scriptures in His Historical Plays, an effort is made to identify as many as possible of the allusions to the Bible in the plays concerned. That Shakespeare uses scriptural references for various purposes--to throw light, for example, on character--is evident; but with these further implications this thesis is not concerned. The study is confined to a purely factual identification of Bible references wherever these can be found.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Sawtell1956>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. <u>RICHARD II.</u>	9
II. <u>FIRST HENRY IV.</u>	36
III. <u>SECOND HENRY IV.</u>	44
IV. <u>HENRY V.</u>	57
V. <u>HENRY VI, PARTS ONE, TWO, AND THREE.</u>	72
VI. <u>RICHARD III.</u>	92
VII. <u>KING JOHN.</u>	106
VIII. <u>HENRY VIII.</u>	112
CONCLUSION.....	119
FOOTNOTES.....	124
APPENDIX.....	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	143

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis, Shakespeare's Use of the Scriptures in His Historical Plays, is to identify as many as possible of the allusions to the Bible in the plays concerned. That Shakespeare uses scriptural references for various purposes--to throw light, for example, on character--is evident; but with these further implications we shall not be concerned. We shall confine ourselves to a purely factual identification of Bible references wherever these can be found.

At the outset we must recognize that dramatic characters have no thoughts of their own, but only those given to them by their creator; nevertheless, to call attention to this fact every time we deal with a scriptural utterance would prove most tedious, both in the writing and reading of these pages. So, having recognized that all the speeches of the characters are those given to them by Shakespeare, often we have felt at liberty to refer to the utterances as those of the characters themselves. For example, in saying that King Richard believes thus and so, we mean simply that Shakespeare portrays him as believing thus and so. Whether or not the historical Richard ever believed this way, or ever made such utterances, is of no consequence to us in this thesis. Moreover, we are not here concerned with the matter of Shakespeare's own belief in respect of any of the doctrines expressed by these

passages, for, as Richard G. Moulton so well points out,

A word of disclaimer must be said against what may be called the Fallacy of Quotations. Nothing is commoner than the attempt to convey the mind of Shakespeare by passages from his plays. Yet this is obviously delusive. . . . For dramatic literature differs from other literature in this, that quotations from a play can never reveal either the mind of the author or the spirit of the drama. . . . For every word in a play some imaginary speaker, and only he, is responsible; and thus in dramatic literature no amount of quotations can give us the mind of the poet or the meaning of the poem.¹

The degree of our justification in identifying Biblical references varies. (1) Some of the quotations have only a possible allusion to Scripture. Actually, these may never have been suggested to Shakespeare by his knowledge of the Bible but may have come to him from some other source. Moreover, sometimes there is a strong possibility that references of this nature contain no allusion to a Bible passage or to a Biblical account, yet these portions have been treated because of their seemingly close parallel with Scripture. (2) Other passages in the historical plays, while apparently stronger in their relationship to the Bible, must still be treated as nothing more than probable references. (3) The rest of the utterances quoted are positive; about them there can be no reasonable doubt as to their connection with the Scriptures.

Although Shakespeare, except in his last play, Henry VIII,² could not have been influenced by the King James Version of the

Bible of 1611, we have consistently quoted it because those who may be interested in reading this thesis have ready access to this translation. However, the writer has carefully checked the Biblical references in the King James Version against those in both the Geneva Bible of 1560 and the Bishops' Bible of 1568³--the two Bibles most likely used by Shakespeare--and noted any significant or interesting alternative rendering in a footnote, when such differences have not been handled in the body of the thesis. In making quotations from the King James Version, the author has ignored its use of italics, for we are not concerned with the translators' critical apparatus. While the King James Version uses no quotation marks, we have supplied them for the sake of clearer, smoother reading. In using quotation marks, we have followed the Revised Standard Version, which has inserted them. Sometimes--usually in the footnotes--the following abbreviations are used: A. V. for the Authorized or King James Version; A. S. V. for the American Standard Version; R. S. V. for the Revised Standard Version; Geneva for the Geneva Bible; and Bishops' for the Bishops' Bible.

When utterances in Shakespeare parallel Scripture passages of a general nature, at times we have quoted but one such Biblical portion without feeling it necessary to specify all. For example, in 2 Henry VI II:i:66-67 King Henry uses the expression "To believing souls [God] / Gives light in darkness"; in drawing attention to a possible scriptural allusion, we have quoted only 2 Cor.

4:6--"God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts"--although the idea of "light in darkness" can be found in more than one place in the Bible: for example, in Luke 1:78-79: "Whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death."

Unfortunately, Variorum volumes have not yet been produced for all of Shakespeare's plays; however, where such do cover the historical plays, these have been consulted concerning the passages of importance quoted in this thesis. When quoting one of these Variorum volumes, the writer simply says Variorum, then follows it with a page number; in each case the volume is the one covering the particular play under study, unless otherwise so indicated. The complete information as to each Variorum volume used will be found in the bibliography.

The writer of this thesis has quoted exclusively from the Neilson and Hill Shakespeare text,⁴ calling attention to any departures from this text by a footnote, if not in the body of the thesis. Consequently, each passage quoted is accompanied by a citation which refers to its location in the Neilson and Hill text. Usually the line-by-line construction of this text is also followed in this thesis, as this procedure makes for easier comparisons. However, in using the Neilson and Hill edition, we have omitted their use of brackets, as we are not concerned with their critical apparatus.

Historically, there is no chronological break in the sequence of the plays from Richard II to Richard III; so we begin our thesis with a study of Richard II and follow right through to the end of Richard III. As the other two historical dramas, King John and Henry VIII, are separated from this large group--the former being much earlier than Richard II and the latter somewhat later than Richard III--we have left them to be dealt with last. In this order we work through these historical plays, considering in each, first the references made to the Bible by the most important characters, then by the miscellaneous minor characters; a separate section is given to each of the leading characters, but only one to those of lesser importance.

The footnotes will be found at the end of the thesis. There they are arranged numerically in sections, a separate section being allocated to each play, as well as ^{to} the opening introductory material.

The reader of this thesis will be impressed, we believe, by the many references Shakespeare makes to the Scriptures in his historical plays. We conclude from this that he must have made a careful personal study of the Bible. The wide circulation of the Scriptures in his day made such a study possible. It must be remembered that by his time it was no longer considered a heresy or a crime to read the Bible in an English translation; rather was the Bible rapidly becoming the book of the common people, even to the point of influencing the phraseology of their daily speech.

Therefore it was only natural that the poet himself should have grown up in the atmosphere of its teachings. In fact, had Shakespeare, living in the very midst of this age of Bible enthusiasm, not been conversant with the Scriptures, it would have been strange indeed.

For proof of this public interest in the Bible, we need only point to the fact that within less than eighty-five years ^{before} ~~of~~ Shakespeare's death (1616) there appeared no less than seven influential English versions. Such translations would not have been produced, printed, and distributed unless there had been sufficient enthusiasm to justify them.

Let us note some of these English versions of the Bible current in Shakespeare's time, versions which gave him ready access to the Scriptures for private study. Wycliffe was the first of importance to render the Latin Bible into English (1382). Tyndale, because of his better knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, produced an improved version (1536). Less than three years later England had her first so-called "authorized" English version, the Great Bible (1539). Tyndale's translation and the Great Bible were paralleled by two other English versions: Coverdale's (1535) and Matthew's (1537). Soon came the most accurate English version produced up to that time, the Geneva Bible (1560). The Bishops' Bible (1568) was recognized as the second "authorized" version. Next (and produced during the greatest period of Shakespeare's dramatic life, yet too late to influence any but his very

last plays) came the most remarkable of all English translations, the third "authorized" version, known as the King James Bible (1611). Surely the appearance of all these versions in so short a period indicates the eagerness of the Englishman of that day to have and to read the Scriptures in his own tongue. Knowing Shakespeare's keen interest in cultural and literary fields, we are not surprised that he became so well versed in the Bible.

I

THE SCRIPTURES IN RICHARD II

As Uttered by Richard II

The ingrained religious disposition of King Richard is apparent from his voiced willingness to resign the crown for the life of a religious ascetic.

What must the King do now? Must he submit?
The King shall do it. Must he be depos'd?
The King shall be contented. Must he lose
The name of king? O' God's name, let it go.
I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
My gorgeous palace for a hermitage,
My gay apparel for an almsman's gown,
My figur'd goblets for a dish of wood,
My sceptre for a palmer's walking-staff,
My subjects for a pair of carved saints.

(III:iii:143-52)

So, knowing that Richard has such a bent for religion, we shall expect, in studying the play, to find this quality revealing itself in his knowledge of the Bible.

First, we find Richard recorded as believing not only in the divine right of kings but also in God's readiness to defend and avenge such kings. In III:ii:54-62 he says:

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.
For every man that Bolingbroke hath press'd
To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown,
God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
A glorious angel; then, if angels fight,
Weak men must fall, for Heaven still guards
the right.

There can be no doubt that in Richard's mind he, as the "anointed king" is "the deputy elected by the Lord." In Shakespeare's historical dramas frequent references are made to the theory of the divine right of kings. Because of the assumption by the characters involved that divine right rested on Biblical sanction, we shall, for the sake of completeness, include these references in the course of this thesis, despite the fact that often they make no direct allusion to scriptural passages. In an appendix¹ we have presented a summary of the historical theory of divine right and have shown the extent to which it receives scriptural support.

Although we can find no specific instance in Scripture of an angelic army defending one of Israel's divinely-anointed kings, Daniel speaks of Michael, the archangel, fighting for God's people,² while Christ made reference to "twelve legions of angels" (Mat. 26: 53) available to defend Him at a moment's notice, should He ask His Father for their protection. Could King Richard have been alluding to Michael as "a glorious angel" and to Christ's "legions of angels" in the phrase "if angels fight"? Maybe so, but we cannot be sure.

A few lines further Richard again speaks of this matter of the divine right of kings. When he learns that more of his subjects have defected to Bolingbroke, he says:

Revolt our subjects? That we cannot mend;
They break their faith to God as well as us.

Here Richard claims that when subjects are disloyal to their king, they are equally guilty of disloyalty to God. Later, this time in III:iii:77-90, King Richard again expresses his belief in divine right:

. . . Show us the hand of God
 That hath dismiss'd us from our stewardship;
 For well we know, no hand of blood and bone
 Can gripe the sacred handle of our sceptre,
 Unless he do profane, steal, or usurp.
 And though you think that all, as you have done,
 Have torn their souls by turning them from us,
 And we are barren and bereft of friends,
 Yet know, my master, God omnipotent,
 Is mustering in his clouds on our behalf
 Armies of pestilence; and they shall strike
 Your children yet unborn and unbegot,
 That lift your vassal hands against my head
 And threat the glory of my precious crown.

Richard declares that only "the hand of God" that entrusted him with the crown has a right to dismiss him from this kingly "stewardship." Could not Richard's challenge--"Show us the hand of God / That hath dismiss'd us from our stewardship"--have been framed from a knowledge of Luke 16:2--"Thou mayest be no longer steward"? Moreover, Richard repeats here the idea that "God omnipotent / Is mustering in his clouds on our behalf / Armies of pestilence." The idea of "armies of pestilence" may have arisen from such a verse as Joel 2:25, where God calls "the locust ..., the cankerworm ..., and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm, my great army." It might also be in place to note, before we leave this passage, that here Richard speaks of God as "my master" and attributes to Him the divine quality of omnipotence.

The next passage we deal with is quite rich in Biblical significance. Sir Stephen Scroop has just related to the king how young and old, men and boys, beardsmen and housewives, have armed themselves against Richard to follow Bolingbroke. Hearing these evil tidings, Richard wonders why four of his close followers, the Earl of Wiltshire, Bagot, Bushy, and Green--have allowed his enemies to make such rapid inroads into his kingdom. Richard vows that if they, too, have proved untrue, "their heads shall pay for it" (III:ii:126). Then Scroop informs him that "Peace have they made with him [Bolingbroke] indeed" (III:ii:128). Richard interprets this remark to mean that these men have become turncoats. Thereupon he pours out this invective:

O villains, vipers, damn'd without redemption!
 Dogs, easily won to fawn on any man!
 Snakes, in my heart-blood warm'd, that sting my heart!
 Three Judases, each one thrice worse than Judas!
 Would they make peace? Terrible hell make war
 Upon their spotted souls for this offence!

(III:ii:129-34)

Vipers and snakes, in the epithets "vipers, damn'd without redemption" and "snakes, in my heart-blood warm'd," echo both the tone and the language of Christ when He excoriated the Scribes and Pharisees as hypocrites:

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!
 . . . Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers,
 how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

(Mat. 23:29, 33)

Perhaps these words given to Richard are suggestive, first, of those fickle multitudes who never were more than hypocritical

followers, even as the Scribes and Pharisees were never actually among Christ's true friends. But what about those who had been admitted to the king's inner circle? These--the Earl of Wiltshire, Bushy, and Green--cannot be classed with the hypocritical followers of Christ; these, more wicked still, remind Richard of the treachery of Judas, one of Jesus' intimates. Such supposedly false friends Richard brands as "Three Judases, each one thrice worse than Judas!" The fact that the king is mistaken as to the guilt of these three followers is irrelevant. True, these have remained faithful to Richard even to the point of paying for it with their heads (lines 138-40); but as yet the king believes them false and directs his curse accordingly. Richard is seen to believe in a "terrible hell," which he invokes to "make war / Upon their spotted souls for this offence!" (lines 133-34). It may be that even this thought of fiery damnation indicates a connection, in Richard's mind, with his reflection upon Judas, whom Christ referred to as "the son of perdition" (John 17:12).³

Before we leave this passage, we might pause to ask why Shakespeare has Richard speak of "three Judases." Why not four? Richard has named four--the Earl of Wiltshire, Baggot, Bushy, and Green--and there is no apparent reason for his exempting one. By reading ahead we know that Baggot lives to be a Judas--the only Judas of the four--but Richard could not have known this at the time he made these castigating remarks.

In III:ii:153-54 Richard speaks of "that small model⁴ of the barren earth / Which serves as paste and cover to our bones." Here his language may be indebted to the account of man's creation: "The LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7).

Act IV is the richest of all in yielding Richard's references to Holy Writ.

Yet I well remember
The favours of these men. Were they not mine?
Did they not sometime cry, "All hail!" to me?
So Judas did to Christ; but He, in twelve,
Found truth in all but one; I, in twelve thousand,
none.

(IV:i:167-71)

As before (III:ii:129-34), in this passage Richard once more makes a clear analogy between Christ's betrayal by Judas and his own at the hands of false friends; only here Richard presses the point until he makes his plight far worse than Christ's: in twelve only one proved untrue to Jesus; in twelve thousand not one proved true to Richard. Of course Richard was not justified in such harsh judgment upon his true friends, but it is what we may expect from one over powered by self-pity.

Several clear references to Scripture, or scriptural events, mark IV:i:228-242. King Richard speaks in response to Northumberland's demands that the deposed king read a paper listing his "grievous crimes" (line 223):

Must I do so? and must I ravel out
My weav'd-up follies? Gentle Northumberland,
If thy offences were upon record,
Would it not shame thee in so fair a troop

To read a lecture of them? If thou wouldst,
 There shouldst thou find one heinous article,
 Containing the deposing of a king
 And cracking the strong warrant of an oath,
 Mark'd with a blot, damn'd in the book of heaven.
 Nay, all of you that stand and look upon me
 Whilst that my wretchedness doth bait myself,
 Though some of you with Pilate wash your hands
 Showing an outward pity; yet you Pilates
 Have here deliver'd me to my sour cross,
 And water cannot wash away your sin.

First, there is reference here to Northumberland being "Mark'd with a blot, damn'd in the book of heaven" (line 236). Richard thinks that Northumberland's part in effecting the deposition of a king of sufficiently wicked import to cause God to damn his soul and blot out his name from heaven's "book of life" (Rev. 3:5).

This figure may have been drawn from either the Old Testament or the New, or both. In Exodus 32:32-33 Moses cries to God, saying:

"Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin----;
 and if not, blot me,⁵ I pray thee, out of thy
 book which thou hast written." And the LORD
 said unto Moses, "Whosoever hath sinned against
 me, him will I blot out of my book."

The thought is also expressed in Deuteronomy 29:20:

"The LORD will not spare him, but then the anger
 of the LORD and his jealousy shall smoke against
 that man, and all the curses that are written in
 this book shall lie upon him, and the LORD shall
 blot out⁶ his name from under heaven."

Were we justified in interpreting "the book of the living" as "the book of life," then there is a close parallel between Psalm 69:28 and Revelation 3:5:

Let them be blotted out⁷ of the book of the
 living and not be written with the righteous.

"He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out⁶ his name out of the book of life."

A familiarity with these passages may account for Richard's line, "Mark'd with a blot, damn'd in the book of heaven."

Next, Richard likens the actions of his deponents to that of Pilate, who, having delivered Jesus over to the rabble crowd to be crucified, washed his own hands in mock pity (line 239). But, says Richard to his enemies, water can no more avail as an ablution for their sins than Pilate's hand-washing could cleanse him from the blood-guilt of Jesus' death. Richard so closely identifies his own experience here with the mock trial of Jesus that he arraigns his English deserters as guilty of delivering their king to a "sour cross."

Pilate's hand-washing deeply impressed Shakespeare, for we find it recurrent in his plays; the most noted reference to it is in the hand-washing scenes of *Macbeth* and *Lady Macbeth*.⁷

To what Richard may be referring in V:i:22-25 is not too clear. He says:

Hie thee [Richard's Queen] to France
And cloister thee in some religious house.
Our holy lives must win a new world's crown,
Which our profane hours here have thrown down.

It may be that he is talking about the possibility of their surviving the present deposition to be restored later, when England will be so transformed as to be "a new world." However, as there is grave doubt ^{whether} ~~that~~ Richard had such hope of survival, to say nothing of restoration, we may suggest that now he is thinking in

terms of obtaining a heavenly reward. Thence, "a new world" would (or, could) refer to the "new heaven" or the "new earth" of Revelation 21:1,¹⁰ while "crown" could symbolize one of the immortal rewards to be accorded saints in heaven.¹¹

Already Richard has spoken at least twice of the idea of divine retribution;¹² when we come to V:i:57-59, we find him prophesying that

The time shall not be many hours of age
More than it is, ere foul sin gathering head
Shall break into corruption.

Whether or not Shakespeare had any definite Scripture in mind when he put these words on Richard's lips, we are not prepared to say; yet they are in keeping with the famed words of Galatians 6:7-8:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for
whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also
reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall
of the flesh reap corruption.

Two definite allusions to Scripture are found in V:v:12-17:

. . . thoughts of things divine, are intermix'd
With scruples and do set the word itself
Against the word:
As thus, "Come, little ones,"¹³ and then again,
"It is as hard to come as for a camel
To thread the postern of a small needle's eye."¹⁴

Shakespeare seldom quotes the Bible verbatim, and this passage is a case in point. Yet without question the two Scriptures he had in mind are Mark 10:14 (or as found in one of the other synoptic gospel accounts: Mat. 19:14 or Luke 18:16) and Mark 10:25 (or

Mat. 24 or Luke 18:25):

Jesus . . . said unto them, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

The maxim that pride precedes a fall has been proverbial for so long it would be presumptuous to assert that Shakespeare was quoting from Proverbs 16:18 when Richard said, "Pride must have a fall" (V:v:88);¹⁵ yet this utterance so approximates the Biblical "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" that the poet may have had this actual proverb in mind.

If King Richard makes other allusions to the Scripture in this play, we have failed to note them.

As Uttered by Bolingbroke

Since Bolingbroke becomes Henry IV in the next two chronicle plays, with special interest we should note here how Shakespeare associates him with our subject. At the very commencement of Richard II, Bolingbroke is presented as one outwardly religious, for three times in the opening scene he expresses theological ideas. Twice in his first important speech he speaks of heaven:

First, heaven be the record to my speech!

.

My body shall make good upon this earth,
Or my divine soul answer it in heaven.

(I:i:30, 37-38)

Because he is contemplating a mortal duel with Mowbray, maybe religious talk is only a natural reaction to the occasion; nevertheless, Bolingbroke here goes beyond a mere mention of heaven; he speaks of both the divinity and destiny of his soul.

A few lines later Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of the murder of the Duke of Gloucester (lines 99-103) and claims that Gloucester's

. . . blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries,
Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth,

To me for justice and rough chastisement.

(I:i:104-6)

This passing reference indicates that both poet and audience must have had more than a passing knowledge of the events associated with Abel. "Sacrificing Abel" alludes to "Abel . . . brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD

had respect unto Abel and to his offering" (Gen. 4:4). Abel's "blood . . . cries, / Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth" is an embellishment of these words of God to murderous Cain: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground" (Gen. 4:10). And here is a rather interesting side light; while Bolingbroke believes that Mowbray should pay for this fratricide,¹⁶ in the Bible Cain was made to pay for his crime not by death but by banishment: "a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth" (Gen. 4:12). Later, when King Richard stopped what was to have been a deadly tilt, Mowbray was also spared from possible death by being banished instead. One cannot help wondering if Shakespeare did not have this comparison in mind when he drew attention to the Cain and Abel incident here. However, in V:vi:43 we are definitely out of the sphere of supposition and into that of precise analogy, for in this line Bolingbroke explicitly says to Exton: "With Cain go wander through the shades of night."

"Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," Jesus taught His disciples to pray (Mat. 6:12). And the Apostle Paul spoke of "forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:32). Bolingbroke's forgiveness of Aumerle is in keeping with this Biblical concept, when he said: "I pardon him, as God shall pardon me" (V:iii:131). While it would be impossible to prove that either of these verses--or any others, for that matter--were in Shakespeare's mind when he penned

Bolingbroke's words; the marked likeness is mentioned here only to show that Bolingbroke's pardon is consistent with these scriptural expressions.

"Abraham's bosom" is an expression of Scripture¹⁷ which Bolingbroke was acquainted with, as seen from this remark made when he heard of Norfolk's death: "Sweet Peace conduct his sweet soul to the bosom / Of good old Abraham!" (IV:i:103-4). The bosom of Abraham is another favourite figure of Shakespeare.¹⁸

As the events associated with Cain's murder of Abel¹⁹ so impressed our dramatist as to be recurrent in Richard II,²⁰ the same is true of Pilate's hand-washing scene.²¹ This drama concludes with Bolingbroke contemplating

. . . a voyage to the Holy Land,
to wash this blood [of Richard's] off from
my guilty hand.

(V:vi:49-50)

However, the efficacy of holy pilgrimages to cleanse away the guilt of sin is a concept foreign to the teachings of Scripture; in fact, such self-efforts are, scripturally, futile as a means of forgiveness.²² Could it be that this thought of futility is intentionally intimated here? Maybe Shakespeare was trying to leave this very impression upon the Bible-enlightened minds of his audience. These men and women may have been quick to recognize the comparison: Bolingbroke's proposed pilgrimage would prove as valueless as Pilate's hand-washing. Then, too, they may have known, as Shakespeare later reveals in the Henry IV plays, that Bolingbroke would

never take such a voyage, but, rather, would die (as Henry IV) with the guilt of Richard's blood still weighing heavily upon his conscience.²³ We may be inferring too much even to suggest such kindred ideas, but at least they seem possible.

As Uttered by John of Gaunt

So far as his references to Scripture are concerned, John of Gaunt seems to be the second most important character in Richard II.

King Richard's party is accused of having plotted and procured the death of Thomas of Woodstock. Since Woodstock was Gaunt's brother, Gaunt says that this close relationship would, naturally, prompt him to take revenge, yet he is ruled otherwise: he chooses rather to put the matter into God's hands.

Alas, the part I had in Woodstock's blood
Doth more solicit me than your exclains
To stir against the butchers of his life!
But since correction lieth in those hands
Which made the fault that we cannot correct,
Put we our quarrel to the will of Heaven;
Who, when they see the hours ripe on earth,
Will rain hot vengeance on offenders' heads.

(I:ii:1-8)

From what source came the philosophy expressed by Gaunt in these last three lines, we shall not aver; but we do suggest that they certainly reflect a familiarity with Romans 12:19-20. "Put we our quarrel to the will of Heaven" harmonizes with "Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, '"Vengeance is mine, I will repay," saith the Lord.'" And Gaunt's

next statement, that "Heaven / . . . Will rain hot vengeance on offenders' heads," compares with Paul's teaching that kindness to one's enemy will "heap coals of fire on his head."

A few lines later, Gaunt returns to the subject, saying that he dares not touch Richard because God (according to the divine right of kings) forbids.

God's is the quarrel; for God's substitute,
His deputy anointed in His sight,
Hath caus'd his death; the which if wrongfully,
Let Heaven revenge; for I may never lift
An angry arm against His minister.

(I:ii:37-41)

Next, when Woodstock's widow asks, "Where then, alas, may I complain myself?" (line 42), Gaunt replies: "To God, the widow's champion and defence" (line 43). Where in the Bible is God spoken of as "the widow's champion and defence"? The answer seems to come from the following passage, a parable probably so familiar to Shakespeare's audience of the day that no more than this passing reference was needed to recall it to their minds.

And he [Jesus] spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, "There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, 'Avenge me of mine adversary.' And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, 'Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.'" And the Lord said, "Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily."

(Luke 18:1-8)

There is also the possibility that Psalm 68:5, a more obscure and remote text, was in mind; this verse reads: "A father of the fatherless, and judge of the widows, is God in his holy habitation."

In Gaunt's prophecy (II:i:31-68) appear several allusions to Scripture. By ^{his} calling England "This other Eden, demi-paradise" (line 42), knowledge of the Biblical Eden is displayed. Then he goes on to say that England's kings are as

Renowned for their deeds as far from home,
For Christian service and true chivalry,
As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry,
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son.

(Lines 53-56)

No one could have penned these lines without being acquainted with the facts (1) that Mary was the mother of Jesus, (2) that He reputedly died to make atonement for the sins of the world, (3) that He was buried in a Palestinian sepulchre, and (4) that He had been rejected by His own Jewish people.

Further down in the same scene, Gaunt calls God his Maker: "Now He that made me knows I see thee [King Richard] ill" (line 93). This thought (or belief) that God is man's maker is a theological concept voiced by many Bible characters: Elpaz (Job 4:17); Elihu (Job 32:22; 35:10; 36:3) the Psalmist (Psalm 95:6); Solomon (Prov. 14:31; 17:5; 22:2); and Isaiah (Isa. 17:7).

Gaunt's last scriptural allusion is during his next speech, when he refers to the departed soul of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester:

My brother Gloucester, plain well-meaning soul,
Whom fair befall in heaven 'mongst happy souls!

(Lines 128-29)

While it may be impossible to pin-point a single Bible verse responsible for Gaunt's expression of felicity, yet happiness is generally associated with Heaven, and passages such as the following tend to confirm it: "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God" (Luke 15:10); "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" (1 Thes. 2:19).

Considering the paucity of Gaunt's appearances in this play, it would seem that his utterances are remarkable for the number of Biblical thoughts they contain.

As Uttered by Mowbray

Mowbray's first brief speech of but three lines may contain a scriptural implication. Addressing King Richard, he says:

Each day still better other's happiness
Until the heavens, envying earth's good hap,
Addan immortal title to your crown!

(I:i:22-24)

"An immortal title to your crown" may contain nothing more than an earthly wish, namely, that Richard shall reign so long and so well that his name will be immortally remembered as one of the great kings in history. On the other hand, it may denote a heavenly reward: that Richard may reign so well on earth that God will grant him an eternal award--"an immortal title"--in heaven.²⁴

Next, Mowbray denies having had any part in Woodstock's untimely death, but confesses that he did plot against Gaunt's life. This premeditated act he rightly calls "a trespass," for

hatred is a murderous sin.²⁵ Yet Mowbray goes on to say that before last partaking of the Communion, he confessed to Gaunt this sin, begged his pardon, and hoped that it was granted.

For you, my noble Lord of Lancaster,
The honourable father to my foe,
Once did I lay an ambush for your life,
A trespass that doth vex my grieved soul;
But ere I last receiv'd the sacrament
I did confess it, and exactly begg'd
Your Grace's pardon; and I hope I had it.
This is my fault. As for the rest appeal'd,
It issues from the rancour of a villain.

(I:i:135-43)

Mowbray's action may not have been dictated by Scripture, yet this procedure of righting wrongs done to our fellow men before partaking of the Lord's Supper is in harmony with Christ's teaching in Matthew 5:22-24:

"But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: . . . Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

There can be no question about the Bible content of the following utterance. Mowbray follows Richard's words "Lions make leopards tame" with "Yea, but not change his spots" (I:i:175). A quick glance at Jeremiah 13:23 will reveal the source of this rejoinder: "Can the Ethiopian²⁶ change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Then, a few lines further in the same speech (lines 176-78), Mowbray goes on to make another allusion to a verse of Scripture, namely,

Proverbs 22:1. Note the comparison:

Mowbray. My dear dear lord,
The purest treasure mortal times afford
Is spotless reputation.

Proverbs. A good name is rather to
be chosen than great riches.²⁷

In our study of Richard's use of Scripture, we have already cited and quoted possible Biblical sources for his attributed belief that one's name can be expunged from the Book of Life;²⁸ so the same passages referred to there have equal validity here, where Mowbray says:

 If ever I were traitor,
My name be blotted from the book of life,
And I from heaven banish'd as from hence!

(I:iii:201-3)

In noting Richard II's references to Scripture, and those made by Bolingbroke, we pointed out how certain Scripture portions and events are recurrently used by Shakespeare--sometimes in the same play, sometimes in separate dramas;²⁹ here is another repetition.

As Uttered by the Bishop of Carlisle

The Bishop of Carlisle's apparent allusions to Scripture are of sufficient frequency to merit our treating him individually. Of course he is just the kind of character we should expect to find using religious terminology, and Shakespeare keeps the ecclesiastic's utterances in character.

He, too, as a friend to the established throne, expresses his belief in the divine right of kings, and believes that God can defend Richard. First, in III:ii:27-28, then in IV:i:125-29, he says:

Fear not, my lord; that Power that made you king
Hath power to keep you king in spite of all.

.....

And shall the figure of God's majesty,
His captain, steward, deputy elect,
Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
Be judg'd by subject and inferior breath,
And he himself not present?

When Carlisle refers to Mowbray's death in Venice following his taking part in the Crusades, the Bishop speaks of him as having given "his pure soul unto his captain Christ":

Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
For Jesu Christ in glorious Christian field,
Streaming the ensign of the Christian cross
Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens;
And, toil'd with works of war, retir'd himself
To Italy; and there at Venice gave
His body to that pleasant country's earth,
And his pure soul unto his captain Christ,
Under whose colours he had fought so long.

(IV:i:92-100)

In the Old Testament there is reference to a strange, mysterious figure appearing to Joshua and saying, "As captain of the host of the LORD am I now come" (Josh. 5:14; cf. v. 15). Some expositors identify this "captain of the LORD's host" with Christ in a pre-incarnate appearance, a divine theophany.³⁰ In the New Testament, the writer of Hebrews speaks of Christ as "the captain"³¹ of their salvation" (Heb. 2:10). From these Bible portions Christ may have come to be considered as a captain; but we cannot say that it was on such grounds that Shakespeare gave Him that title here. Thinking of Mowbray's military service in the Crusades, certainly Shakespeare was justified in calling Christ captain.

A few lines further Carlisle is given the tongue of a prophet predicting the Wars of the Roses, saying:

My Lord of Hereford here, whom you call king,
Is a foul traitor to proud Hereford's king;
And if you crown him, let me prophesy,
The blood of English shall manure the ground,
And future ages groan for this foul act.
Peace shall go sleep with Turks and infidels,
And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars
Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound.
Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny
Shall here inhabit, and this land be call'd
The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls.
O, if you raise this house against this house,
It will the woefullest division prove
That ever fell upon this cursed earth.

(IV:i:134-47)

Here, in line 144, a blood-drenched, war-torn England is to "be call'd / The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls."³² This analogy is drawn from the Gospel accounts. Matthew's counterpart is: "They . . . [came] unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull" (Mat. 27:33). The Apostle John, in his corresponding portion, tells us that Jesus "bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull,"³³ which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha" (John 19:17). There is one other Bible reference to Golgotha, and that is by the evangelist Mark: "They bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull"³⁴ (Mk. 15:22). While the reference to Golgotha is definitely scriptural, there is nothing in Scripture to justify pluralizing skull except the Genevan rendering, "the place of dead mens skulles." This rendering makes more vivid Carlisle's prophetic picture of England as so decimated by civil war that the carnage would leave the country strewn with "dead men's skulls."

In the very next couple of lines, another allusion is made to Scripture:

O, if you raise this house against this house
It will the woofullest division prove.

(Lines 145-46)

This prediction is a definite play upon Christ's words:

"Every kingdom divided against itself is
brought to desolation; and every city or
house divided against itself shall not
stand."

(Mat. 12:25)

As Uttered by the Duchess of York

Of the utterances of the four women appearing in Richard II., only those of the Duchess of York shall we consider at any length. Although never once can we be sure that we are on solid footing here, the possibility of these associations rate high enough for them to be included under this section, despite the recognition that we are constantly in the sphere of the theoretical.

Bishop Wordsworth, in his On Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible,³⁵ gives an extended dissertation on the dramatist's debt to the Bible for much imagery and phraseology. The following may be an example, where the Duchess says:

Edward's seven sons, whereof thyself [Gaunt]
art one,
Were as seven vials of his sacred blood.

(I:iii:11-12)

Where could he have gotten the simile of the "seven vials"? Mention is made in Revelation 15:7 of there being given "unto the

seven angels seven golden vials." We cannot press the figure further, for there can be no analogy between the "seven vials of his [Edward III's] sacred blood" and "seven golden vials full of the wrath of God"; it is only the poet's possible knowledge of the Scripture expression giving rise to the present figure that we suggest here.

York is hastening to wreak vengeance upon his son Aumerle when his wife asks, "Wilt thou not hide the trespass of thine own?" (V:ii:89). Should not a father's love prompt him to shield rather than expose his own son? Maybe the Duchess' question can be attributed to her creator's acquaintance with 1 Peter 4:8-- "Charity shall cover the multitude of sins"--or Proverbs 17:9-- "He that covereth a transgression seeketh love."

The evangelists Matthew and Mark³⁶ both record how Jesus was struck by the Syrophenician woman's refusal to accept No as an answer to her impassioned pleas to heal her daughter. Who can say whether or not Shakespeare was inspired by this account when he depicted the Duchess of York pleading for the life of her son? Howbeit, as the persistency of the one suppliant vies with that of the other, we quote the two accounts without additional comment, leaving it to the reader to draw whatever parallels he pleases, if any.

Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil." But he answered her not a word.

And his disciples came and besought him, saying, "Send her away; for she crieth after us." But he answered and said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Then came she and worshipped him, saying, "Lord, help me." But he answered and said, "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." And she said, "Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table." Then Jesus answered and said unto her, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt." And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.

(Mat. 15:21-28)

Duchess. O King, believe not this hard-hearted man! [Duke of York]
Love loving not itself none other can.

.....

gentle liege. Hear me, [Kneels.]
Bolingbroke. Rise up, good aunt.
Duch. Not yet, I thee beseech.
For ever will I walk upon my knees,
And never see day that the happy sees,
Till thou give joy; until thou bid me joy
By pardoning Rutland, my transgressing boy.
Aumerle. Unto my mother's prayers I bend my knee.

[Kneels.]
York. Against them both my true joints bended be.
[Kneels.]

Ill mayst thou thrive, if thou grant any grace!

Duch. Pleads he in earnest? Look upon his face;
His eyes do drop no tears, his prayers are in jest;
His words come from his mouth, ours from our breast.
He prays but faintly and would be deni'd;
We pray with heart and soul and all beside.
His weary joints would gladly rise, I know;
Our knees shall kneel till to the ground they grow.
His prayers are full of false hypocrisy;
Ours of true zeal and deep integrity.
Our prayers do out-pray his; then let them have
That mercy which true prayer ought to have.

Boling. Good aunt, stand up.

Duch. Nay, do not say, "Stand up";
Say "Pardon" first, and afterwards "Stand up."
And if I were thy nurse, thy tongue to teach,
"Pardon" should be the first word of thy speech.
I never long'd to hear a word till now.
Say "pardon," King; let pity teach thee how.

The word is short, but not so short as sweet;
No word like "pardon" for kings' mouths so meet.

.

Boling. Good aunt, stand up.

Duch. I do not sue to stand;

Pardon is all the suit I have in hand.

Boling. I pardon him, as God shall pardon me.

Duch. O happy vantage of a kneeling knee!

(V:iii:87-132)

Finally, of all the Duchess' remarks, her comment to Aumerle comes perhaps the closest to Scripture when she says, rising from her knees as his successful advocate, "Come, my old son; I pray God make thee new" (V:iii:146). Of course she is praying that her "old son" may in his future conduct prove a "new" son, but this idea of such conversion is couched in the very terms of Scripture, as the following texts reveal:

If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature:
old things are passed away; behold, all things
are become new.

(2 Cor. 5:17)

Put off the old man with his deeds; and . . .
put on the new man.

(Col. 3:9-10)

That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

(Eph. 4:22-24)

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

We shall conclude our study of Richard II by briefly gathering together in this section the references to Scripture made by the miscellaneous characters in the play.

The Duke of York speaks of "Him that gave me life" (II: iii:155), and by so doing he recognizes that life, his own at least, is a gift from God. The Apostle John says of Christ: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men" (John 1:4), which statement may be the New Testament expression of that truth found in Genesis 2:7: "God breathed into his [man's] nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

In 2 Samuel 13:15 we read: "Then Amnon hated her [his half-sister, Tamar] exceedingly; so that the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her." If Scroop had not this account in mind when he uttered the following lines, he closely approached its truth, to say the least:

Sweet love, I see, changing his property,
Turns to the sourest and most deadly hate.

(III:ii:135-36)

Scroop also approximates the language of the Bible when he says:

Men judge by the complexion of the sky
The state and inclination of the day.

(III:ii:194-95)

This utterance closely follows the words of Jesus when he said:

"When it is evening, ye say, 'It will be fair weather: for the sky is red.' And in the morning, 'It will be foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring.' O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

(Mat. 16:2-3)

In one brief speech addressed to the Gardener, Richard's Queen makes rapid allusions to the third chapter of Genesis. She refers to the Garden of Eden, Adam, Eve, the serpent, the fall of man, and the resultant curse pronounced upon man:

Thou, old Adam's likeness, set to dress this garden,
How dares thy harsh rude tongue sound this
unpleasing news?
What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee
To make a second fall of cursed man?

(III:iv:73-76)

Northumberland echoes the language of Matthew 27:25--"His blood be on us"--in his cry, "My guilt be on my head" (V:i:69).

Green's association of comfort with heaven and pain with hell--

My comfort is that heaven will take our souls
And plague injustice with the pains of hell--

(III:i:33-34)

could have been drawn from a knowledge of the account of the rich man and Lazarus:

"The beggar died, and was carried by the angels
into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died,
and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes,
being in torments. . . . Abraham said, 'Son,
. . . Lazarus . . . is comforted, and thou art
tormented.'"

(Luke 16:22-23, 25)

At times it is difficult to distinguish between theological ideas and strictly scriptural references. While there are numerous instances of the former which we have not dealt with in the scope of our study of Richard II, we believe we have adequately dealt with the later.

II

THE SCRIPTURES IN 1 HENRY IVAs Uttered by Henry IV

In the Henry IV plays King Henry makes various and repeated references to both Scripture and scriptural events, but none is more remarkable than the one which appears in his opening speech:

Therefore, friends,
As far as to the sepulchre of Christ,
Whose soldier now, under whose blessed cross
We are impressed and engag'd to fight,
Forthwith a power of English shall we levy,
Whose arms were moulded in their mother's womb
To chase these pagans in those holy fields
Over whose acres walk'd those blessed feet
Which fourteen hundred years ago were nail'd
For our advantage on the bitter cross.

(I:i:19-27)

Here is a passage into which Shakespeare has tenderly woven the doctrine of the atonement. Two references are made to the cross: "the bitter cross" (line 27) emphasizes Christ's agony; the "blessed cross" (line 20) stresses man's benefits. In the plainest of terms King Henry speaks of Christ's sufferings as vicarious: "those blessed feet . . . were nail'd / For our advantage on the bitter cross" (lines 25-27). This substitutionary concept of Christ's death on the cross is supported by various Scriptures. The following are ample examples:

Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried
our sorrows: . . . he was wounded for our
transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities:
the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and
with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep
have gone astray; we have turned every one to his
own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity
of us all.

(Isaiah 53:4-6)

Who [Christ] his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

(1 Peter 2:24-25)

For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.

(1 Peter 3:18)

For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. . . . But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

(Romans 5:6, 8)

For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, [he] who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

(2 Cor. 5:21)

"For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

(Mat. 26:28)

Palestine's "acres" are made "holy fields," sanctified because Christ's "blessed feet" trod upon them. Perhaps we could justly add that they were made additionally holy because His "sepulchre" is also there. These sacred teachings of the Church are not treated as fictitious or legendary accounts but as matters based upon historical events dated "fourteen hundred years" (I:i:26) prior to the time of Henry's speech. This speech was occasioned by King Henry's intention to send English troops to participate in the Crusades. Henry makes further reference to this in I:i:48 and 102 as "our business for the Holy Land" and "Our holy purpose to Jerusalem."

While quite a number of theological sentiments are expressed by King Henry in this drama, only one other utterance of his seems to have any direct reference to Scripture. He may have had Proverbs 27:7 in mind--"The full soul loatheth an honeycomb"--when he said:

They surfeited with honey and began
To loathe the taste of sweetness.

(III:ii:71-72)

As Uttered by Prince Henry

Next, we shall consider Prince Henry's references to Scripture. With but one exception, all of Hal's utterances, like those of Falstaff which we shall examine later, are made in fun. His first allusion to the Bible is found in I:ii:99-100: " . . . wisdom cries out in the streets, and no man regards it." Although the Prince is speaking in the lighter vein, he may be thinking of the first chapter of the Proverbs, particularly verses 20 and 24:¹

Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice
in the streets: she crieth . . . , "I have
stretched out my hand, and no man regarded."

The language parallel here is too apparent to be overlooked.

Some knowledge of Adam is lightly revealed when he says:

I am now of all humours that have
showed themselves humours since the old days of
goodman Adam to the pupil age of this present
twelve o'clock at midnight.

(II:iv:104-7)

Sometimes we hear Galatians 5:4 quoted as describing a person completely out of favour with God: "Ye are fallen from grace." It is likely that Hal is making reference to this expression--and

with this interpretation in mind--when he chaffs Falstaff thus:

Thou art violently carried
away from grace. There is a devil haunts thee in
the likeness of an old fat man; a tun of man is thy
companion.

(II:iv:491-94)

The only serious reference the Prince seems to make to sacred matters in this play is uttered before his father, King Henry IV, when God is recognized as a pardoning God, thus: "God forgive them that so much have sway'd / Your Majesty's good thoughts away from me!" (III:ii:130-31); but this passage contains no reference to Scripture.

Twice in his Henry IV dramas Shakespeare makes a character speak of owing God a death. It is in the mouth of the Prince as he addresses Falstaff, saying, "Thou owest God a death" (1 Henry IV V:i:127); later it is from the lips of Feeble: "A man can die but once; we owe God a death" (2 Henry IV III:ii:250-51). Were we restricted to but the first of these two statements, we might question any Biblical derivation, yet the second occurrence seems to point to Hebrews 9:27: "It is appointed unto men once to die."

As Uttered by Hotspur

In 1 Henry IV there are probably five scriptural references made by Hotspur. Since 1 Peter 5:8 declares that "the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about," it is possible that Shakespeare had this verse in mind when Hotspur says, "An if the devil come and roar for them, / I will not send them" (I:iii:125-26).

A few lines later Hotspur attributes forgiveness to God as he exclaims, "God pardon it!" (I:iii:174). But soon he invokes both the devil and God in the same breath: "O, the devil take such cozeners!--God forgive me!" (I:iii:255). Why does Hotspur so suddenly ask for forgiveness? Could it be a sensitive conscience which quickly convicts him for having made such an irreverent remark? Neither this idea of God being a pardoning God nor the reference to the devil necessarily relates to a knowledge of Scripture, however in Hotspur's next speech alluding to the devil, there may be some relationship to the Bible.

And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the devil
By telling truth. "Tell truth and shame the devil."
If thou have power to raise him, bring him hither,
And I'll be sworn I have power to shame him hence.
O, while you live, tell truth and shame the devil!

(III:i:58-62)

It is quite evident that these comments revolve around a proverb current in Shakespeare's day, namely, "Tell truth and shame the devil"; but since this contrast is in harmony with Christ's sharp words in John 8:44, we shall note those words in passing:

"The devil . . . abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it."

As Uttered by Falstaff

So far as the number of allusions to the Bible is concerned, Falstaff leads the field in 1 Henry IV; yet none of his remarks are more than quick, casual, clever quips. This fact must mean that Shakespeare's audiences were so well acquainted with the Scriptures

that they readily recognized and enjoyed these comments as fitting, even though Falstaff handled them with characteristic levity. His allusions to the Bible are varied and numerous.

The scriptural custom of singing psalms² is referred to by Falstaff in II:iv:147: "I would I were a weaver; I could sing psalms or anything." The Variorum quotes Warburton (ed. 1747), thus: "In the persecutions of the Protestants in Flanders under Philip II, those who came over to England on that occasion, brought with them the woollen manufactory. These were Calvinists, who were always distinguished for their love of psalmody."³ Yet no mention is made here of the fact that the practice of the Calvinists was brought about by their rigid adherence to the Bible, including the singing of psalms.

Next, Falstaff makes reference to both Jew and Hebrew in II:iv:197-98: "They were bound, every man of them, or I am a Jew else, an Ebrew Jew." Certainly we cannot tie to this any definite reference to³ verse of Scripture, yet it is likely that Falstaff meant to relate the remark to his hearers' knowledge of Bible history. We come much closer to identifying his reference to a Biblical expression when we say that his words "Watch to-night, pray to-morrow" (II:iv:305) allude to Christ's admonition to his disciples to "Watch and pray" (Mat. 26:41). Another reference is made to Christ's words when he says, "The tree may be known by the fruit, as the fruit by the tree" (II:iv:470-71), for this utterance immediately brings to our minds the words "Ye shall know them by

their fruits" (Mat. 7:16). However, this sentence may be Falstaff's summary of Christ's teaching in these verses, 16 to 18, in Matthew.⁴

Falstaff alludes to Pharaoh's dream (Gen. 41:17-21), saying, "If to be fat be to be hated, then Pharaoh's lean kine are to be loved" (II:iv:519-20).

In the next Act, the account of the rich man (commonly called Dives, since in Latin that term means rich) and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) is in mind when Falstaff says of Bardolph: "I never see thy face but I think upon hell-fire and Dives that lived in purple; for there he is in his robes burning, burning" (III:iii:35-37).⁵ He makes reference to another part of the same Bible portion when, later, he mentions "slaves as ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth, where the glutton's⁶ dogs licked his sores" (IV:ii:27-29). Still considering Act III, we find that man's Fall (Gen. 3) is at the back of Falstaff's quip uttered in these words:

Dost thou hear, Hal? Thou know'st in the state
of innocency Adam fell; and what should poor
Jack Falstaff do in the days of villany?

(III:iii:185-87)

And now, coming to Act IV, we note Falstaff's final reference to Scripture recorded in 1 Henry IV, where the details of the following quotation come from the well-known parable of the Prodigal (Luke 15:11-32):

You would think that I had a hundred and fifty
tatter'd prodigals lately come from swine-keeping,
from eating draff and husks.

(IV:ii:36-38)

Thomas Carter says: "Many of the Biblical passages quoted by Shakespeare are found only in the Genevan version. . . . The word huskes is not found in Coverdale, Matthew's, Cranmer's, the Bishops', nor the Great Bible; but in the Genevan, the passage runs: 'And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks the swine ate.'"7

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

Although the miscellaneous characters make some theological utterances, not a one, so far as we can discern, makes any direct or indirect allusion to Scripture.

III

THE SCRIPTURES IN 2 HENRY IVAs Uttered by Henry IV

In 2 Henry IV as in 1 Henry IV, King Henry makes little use of Scripture in his speeches. It is not until III:i:45-51 that we find him making any statement that may be interpreted as an allusion to the Bible, and even here the connection is very doubtful. Yet there is a faint possibility that some parallel exists between his comments and Psalm 46, since in places the language is quite similar. The King says:

O God! that one might read the book of fate,
And see the revolution of the times
Make mountains level, and the continent,
Weary of solid firmness, melt itself
Into the sea! and, other times, to see
The beachy girdle of the ocean
Too wide for Neptune's hips.

Psalm 46:2 reads:

Therefore will not we fear, though the earth
be removed, and though the mountains be carried
into the midst of the sea.

However, there are other views on this passage. Consulting the Variorum, p. 223, we find Thomas Carter, Shakespeare and Holy Scripture (1905, p. 276), suggesting that we compare Amos 9:5:

"The Lord GOD of hosts is he that toucheth the land, and it shall melt, and all that dwell therein shall mourn: and it shall rise up wholly as a flood; and shall be drowned, as by the flood of Egypt." But William Sidney Walker, A Critical Examination of the

Text of Shakespeare (1860, Vol. I, p. 152), refers to Ovid's Metamorphoses xv. 2613 (tr. Golding, 1567, f. 190): "Euen so haue places oftentimes exchaunged theyr estate. For I haue seene it sea which was substanciall ground alate, Ageine where sea was, I haue seen the same become dry lond, And shelles and scales of Seafish farre haue lyen from any strond." Still another, T. G. Tucker, says: "The realization that the sea encroached upon the land and vice versa was as old as the Greek geographers" (The Sonnets of Shakespeare, Edited from the Quarto of 1609, with Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge, 1924, p. 139).¹ Considering this passage as a whole, we feel that it approximates to Ovid, as quoted above by Walker, closer than to the Bible.

A definite reference is made to Palestine as "the Holy Land" in III:i:108, and again in IV:v:211 and 239. But even the expression Holy Land is not found in the Bible. The Scriptures speak of "holy ground" (Ex. 3:5), a spot near Mt. Sinai on the Sinai Peninsula; "holy mountain" (Isa. 11:9; Ezk. 20:40; etc.); "holy people" (Deut. 7:6; Isa. 62:12; etc.); "holy place" (Ex. 28:29; Isa. 57:15; etc.); "holy temple" (Psa. 5:7; Micha 1:2; etc.); but never holy land. So we cannot yet say that we have discovered a clear instance of King Henry alluding to the Bible in this drama, and if he is not referring to Scripture in the following remark, then it would seem that there are no true allusions made by him in 2 Henry IV. Nearing his death the conscience-smitten Henry says:

God knows, my son,
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown.

.
How I came by the crown, O God forgive.

(IV:v:184-86, 219)

Concerning lines 185-86 Noble says: "Although doubtless the figure was common enough, still it is to be noted that it is also Biblical. See Prov. ii. 14-15: 'and delite in the wickednesse of the euil: whose wayes are crooked, and they frowarde in their pathes.'" ²

As Uttered by Prince Henry

As he nears the throne, then comes into actual possession of it, Prince Henry, in 2 Henry IV, becomes progressively more serious. Light banter with his frivolous friends disappears. Soon he is proposing (Act IV), then claiming (Act V), his own conversion; and finally he is seen urging reformation upon his old associates (V:v:59-75). However from what we read in 2 Henry IV, there is nothing to indicate that Henry's conversion was anything more than a moral reformation made in the strength of his own will. Neither here nor in Henry V does he make any statement of "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21), which marks are usually considered indications of true Christian conversion. Nevertheless, it is evident that Shakespeare intended to show that Henry V's change was sincere, genuine, and lasting. If we could trust the Archbishop of Canterbury to speak for Shakespeare in Henry V I:i:22-37, then we could also say that the dramatist believed that Henry's change was wrought in the true Christian

manner, for the Archbishop speaks of it as such, and uses some Scripture terminology in explaining it. These points we shall consider when we come to study Henry V, but there seems little or nothing here in 2 Henry IV to connect his "conversion" with the Bible.

Touching on the matter of the divine right of kings, we find Prince Henry voicing such confidence in God's omnipotent guardianship of ^{his} coming reign that he believes all the world combined shall not be able to wrest the crown from him; putting on the crown, he says:

Lo, where it sits,
Which God shall guard; and put the world's whole
strength
Into one giant arm, it shall not force
This lineal honour from me. This from thee [Henry IV]
Will I to mine leave, as 'tis left to me.

(IV:v:43-47)

Being reproved by his father for thus putting on the crown prematurely, the Prince, in the course of his explanatory remarks, speaks of God as the One "that wears the crown immortally":

There is your crown;
And He that wears the crown immortally
Long guard it yours!

(IV:v:143-45)

This last quotation seems to be the only one Prince Henry makes that we might interpret as alluding to Scripture. His reference to the One who "wears the crown immortally" may come from the Apostle Paul's words in 1 Timothy 1:17: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal." However, this association is too remote to be definite.

As Uttered by Lancaster

Although Lancaster is one of the important characters in 2 Henry IV, we can find but one speech by him in which he may be making an allusion to Scripture. Berating the Archbishop of York, Lancaster says:

My Lord of York, it better show'd with you
 When that your flock, assembled by the bell,
 Encircled you to hear with reverence
 Your exposition on the holy text
 Than now to see you here an iron man,
 Cheering a rout of rebels with your drum,
 Turning the Word to sword and life to death.
 That man that sits within a monarch's heart
 And ripens in the sunshine of his favour,
 Would he abuse the countenance of the King,
 Alack, what mischiefs might he set abroad
 In shadow of such greatness! With you, Lord Bishop,
 It is even so. Who hath not heard it spoken
 How deep you were within the books of God?
 To us the speaker in His parliament;
 To us the imagin'd voice of God himself;
 The very opener and intelligencer
 Between the grace, the sanctities, of Heaven
 And our dull workings. O, who shall believe
 But you misuse the reverence of your place,
 Employ the countenance and grace of Heaven,
 As a false favourite doth his prince's name,
 In deeds dishonourable? You have ta'en up,
 Under the counterfeited zeal of God,
 The subjects of His substitute, my father,
 And both against the peace of Heaven and him
 Have here upswarm'd them.

(IV:ii:4-30)

Here the Christian minister's responsibility is to be "deep . . . within the books of God," to expound "the holy text," to be "the speaker of His parliament," "the imagin'd voice of God himself," "the very opener and intelligencer / Between the grace, the sanctities, of Heaven / And [the layman's] dull workings." How beautifully put! How exalted is the man of God, the minister of His Word!

And it is primarily because of this last term, the Word, that we have quoted this passage at length. In speaking of the Bible, Lancaster has called it "the Word" (line 10) and associated it with "sword"--"Turning the Word to sword." Perhaps this phrase is nothing more than a play on words; but, even so, such play may have come from Shakespeare's knowledge of the close association of the terms sword and word as found in Ephesians 6:17: "Take . . . the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." In The Merry Wives of Windsor, III:i:44-45, the same association is made: "What, the sword and word! Do you study them both, Master Parson?"

In both these passages Sword and Word are treated as an antithesis, whereas in Eph. vi. 17 they form an identity--'the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God.' It is not clear that Shakespeare was quoting directly from Ephesians; if he did, then he was misinterpreting and misapplying the text. Ultimately, no doubt, Ephesians was responsible for the jingle of the two words, but it is much more likely that Shakespeare's immediate source was current controversy, in which the words frequently occur.³

Since in this thesis we are calling attention to references made to the divine right theory, we must note that in this passage Lancaster speaks of it in his statement that the Archbishop has

. . . taken up,
Under the counterfeited zeal of God,
The subjects of His substitute, my father.

(IV:ii:26-28)

As Uttered by Falstaff

Throughout the Second Part of Henry IV, as during the First Part, Falstaff is seen jovially commingling the sacred and the

secular. Man is "foolish-compounded clay" in I:ii:8.⁴ The "clay" part is scriptural, for "God formed man of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7); but the "foolish-compounded" part must be attributed to Falstaff's fulmination.

Falstaff is shown as one repeatedly quoting portions from the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19 f). Twice in 1 Henry IV he has done so (III:iii:35-36; IV:ii:27-29),⁵ and now he does so again:

Let him be damn'd like the glutton! Pray
God his tongue be hotter! A whoreson Achitophel!⁶

(I:ii:39-41)

Here the Rich Man, or Dives, is referred to as "the glutton," a term, no doubt, referring to the fact that he "fared sumptuously every day" (Luke 16:19). But in these three lines above another allusion is made to Scripture. Achitophel is the Ahithophel of the King James Version, David's counsellor who defected and joined Absalom's rebellion (2 Samuel 15-17). But as we go on examining this same Scene, we find Falstaff speaking as one acquainted with the poverty and "patience of Job" (James 5:11), saying: "I am as poor as Job, my lord, but not so patient"⁷ (I:ii:144-45). A few lines later he is found punning on the scriptural idea of repenting "in sackcloth and ashes" (Mat. 11:31):

I have check'd him for it,
and the young lion repents; marry, not in ashes
and sackcloth, but in new silk and old sack.

(I:ii:220-22)

The story of the Prodigal Son is another favourite passage with Falstaff.⁸ He has referred to it in 1 Henry IV (IV:ii:36-38); now he speaks of it again. Here he suggests the narrative as a subject for a wall painting:

. . . for thy walls, a pretty slight drollery, or story of the Prodigal, or the German hunting in water-work, is worth a thousand of these bed-hangers and these fly-bitten tapestries.

(II:i:156-59)

We quote the following passage in full to catch its various Biblical allusions:

Falstaff. The fiend hath prick'd down Bardolph irrecoverable; and his face is Lucifer's privy-kitchen, where he doth nothing but roast malt-worms. For the boy, there is a good angel about him; but the devil blinds him too.

Prince. For the women?

Fal. For one of them, she is in hell already, and burns poor souls. For the other, I owe her money; and whether she be damn'd for that, I know not.

Hostess. No, I warrant you.

Fal. No, I think thou art not; I think thou art quit for that. Marry, there is another indictment upon thee, for suffering flesh to be eaten in thy house, contrary to the law; for the which I think thou wilt howl.

Host. All victuallers do so. What's a joint of mutton or two in a whole Lent?

Prince. You, gentlewoman,--

Doll. What says your Grace?

Fal. His grace says that which his flesh rebels against.

(II:iv:359-80)

The idea of "a good angel" (line 362) as a guardian angel, especially for the young, probably stems from a knowledge of Matthew 18:10:

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."

However, as Miss Winstanley points out (as quoted in the Variorum, p. 209): "In the old moralities it was usual to represent a man as attended by two angels, a good and an evil angel, who made alternate bids for his soul. This phrase may be a reference to Marlowe's Dr. Faustus, in which the same thing occurs (vi [=II:ii]); the devil does outbid the good angel." Following the talk about the good angel, Falstaff goes on to say, "But the devil blinds⁹ him too" (II:iv:362-63). This thought is in harmony with 2 Corinthians 4:4: "The god of this world¹⁰ hath blinded the minds of them which believe not." In this same passage Falstaff also refers to Lucifer as another name for Satan. This is another scriptural idea recurrent in Shakespeare's plays: Lucifer as Satan is mentioned in 1 Henry IV II:iv:371-72, and again by Falstaff here (line 360). Continuing with these same lines, we find Falstaff associating hell with burning and damnation (lines 365-66),¹¹ and contrasting grace with the flesh. For the scriptural association of these terms we need only consult these verses: "In hell he [Dives] lift up his eyes, being in torments. . . . 'I am tormented in this flame'" (Luke 16:23, 25); "the desires of the flesh are against the Spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh; for these are opposed to each other" (Gal. 5:17, R.S.V.).

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

Quickly we shall dispose of the remaining references to Scripture in 2 Henry IV made by the following miscellaneous characters.

Although a cross was a coin (so called because it was stamped with a cross) and reference here is made to such a reply to Falstaff's request for "a thousand pound" (I:ii:50), the Chief Justice may be punning on scriptural cross-bearing when he says: "You are too impatient to bear crosses" (I:ii:252-53). While repentance is a doctrine in the Bible, there is no evidence that the Chief Justice had the Bible in mind when he demanded that Falstaff first repay the money he owed the Hostess, then repent for the moral wrong he had done her:

Pray thee, peace. Pay her the debt
you owe her, and unpay the villainy you have
done with her. The one you may do with sterling
money, and the other with current repentance.

(II:i:129-32)

Ideas from Luke 14:28 seem to be incorporated by Bardolph in four lines of one of his speeches. In the Bible passage we find Jesus saying: "Which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost?" Now we note that Bardolph says:

When we mean to build,
We first survey the plot, then draw the model;
And when we see the figure of the house,
Then must we rate the cost of the erection.

(I:iii:41-44)

Additional evidence that Shakespeare may have had this portion of Scripture in mind when he penned these lines is the fact that as in Luke 14:28-32 Christ speaks both of building and warfare, so Bardolph talks about both warfare and building in this one speech (I:iii:36-47).

The following comment by the Archbishop may have been inspired by 2 Peter 2:22. The Apostle Peter refers to a proverb current in his day, saying: "It happened unto them according to the true proverb, 'The dog is turned to his own vomit again.'" The Archbishop says:

So, so, thou common dog, didst thou disgrace
Thy glutton bosom of the royal Richard;
And now thou wouldst eat thy dead vomit up.

(I:iii:97-99)

Later Shakespeare again refers to this passage of Scripture when he has the French Dauphin quote it in French (Henry V III:vii:68-69).

Next, we find the Hostess making two probable allusions to Bible portions. The first is when she exclaims to Falstaff, "Wilt thou kill God's officers and the King's?" (II:i:56-57). In such Scriptures as Romans 13:3-4 and 1 Peter 2:13-15 the king's officers are spoken of as God's officers for preserving law and order, and as such God commands that these men are to be respectfully obeyed. The Hostess' second use of Scripture is when she refers to Doll Tearsheet as "the weaker vessel" (II:iv:65), for here she uses precisely the phrase found in 1 Peter 3:7: "Husbands, dwell with them [your wives] according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel."

Shallow, in III:ii:41-42, is purporting to quote from the Psalms, when he says: "Death, as the Psalmist saith,¹² is certain to all; all shall die." In the Bible there is no specific "Death

is certain to all; all shall die"; but since Shakespeare seldom quotes the Bible verbatim (as already noted), but rather approximates Scripture, Shallow's reference may be to a verse such as Psalm 89:48: "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?" Or perhaps Shallow is simply generalizing this truth as found written by the Psalmist, as in Psalm 49:10-14, for instance: "For he seeth that wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others. . . . Man being in honour abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish. . . . Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them." Still, on the other hand, since Shallow is shallow, just as his name suggests, he may not be quoting from the Psalms at all; like many who know but mislocate Scripture, he may be pictured here as one who thinks he is quoting from the Psalms when, actually, he may be referring to Hebrews 9:27: "It is appointed unto men once to die."

Finally, we note this conversation between the Chief Justice and Warwick:

Ch. Just. How doth the king?
War. Exceeding well; his cares are now all ended.
Ch. Just. I hope not dead?
War. He's walk'd the way of nature;
 And, to our purposes, he lives no more.

(V:ii:2-5)

Says Bishop Wordsworth:

This happy notion and expression of our poet that it is "well"--"exceeding well"--with the departed, was perhaps derived from the reply which the good Shunamite gave to the Prophet Elisha, when he asked

her,--

Is it well with the child? And she answered,
It is well--

2 Kings, iv. 26.

though the child was dead.¹³

IV

THE SCRIPTURES IN HENRY VAs Uttered by Henry V

Henry V seems to be Shakespeare's ideal of a monarch; at least of the seven English kings the dramatist features in his chronicle plays, Henry V is presented in the best light. Henry is here seen as a devout Christian king. In Act One he calls himself a "Christian king" (ii:241), refers to his "wilder days" (ii:267), talks of "God's help" (ii:222), "God's grace" (ii:262), and "the will of God" (ii:289). Yet there is not very much in the play itself which reveals his knowledge and use of the Scriptures, even though the Archbishop of Canterbury "would desire the King were made a prelate" (I:i:40).

Henry's first utterance important to our study is: "What you speak is in your conscience wash'd / As pure as sin with baptism" (I:ii:31-32). Does not this statement approximate 1 Peter 3:21 near enough to leave no doubt in our minds that the basis of Henry's remark is a knowledge of this verse? The Apostle Peter writes: "Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

When we come to Act Two we find something more of real scriptural significance. The following speech is important because it contains snatches of demonology from various sources:

And whatsoever cunning fiend it was
 That wrought upon thee so preposterously
 Hath got the voice in hell for excellence;
 And other devils that suggest by treasons
 Do botch and bungle up damnation
 With patches, colours, and with forms being fetch'd
 From glist'ring semblances of piety.

.....
 If that same demon that hath gull'd thee thus
 Should with his lion gait walk the whole world
 He might return to vasty Tartar back,
 And tell the legions, "I can never win
 A soul so easy as that Englishman's."

(II:ii:111-17, 121-25)

This is part of Henry's scathing rebuke and condemnation of the three traitors, Cambridge, Grey, and Scroop; and he characterizes their murderous plot against his life as a scheme born in hell and cleverly executed by hell's legions, the demons. This passage, like so many others in the dramas, shows that Shakespeare is following the conception that hell is the home of the devil (Satan) and his imps (devils, or demons). The King James Version has not aided in clarifying the fact that the original Greek New Testament Scriptures refer to but one devil (Satan) aided by many demons, as it repeatedly translates demons as devils, demon as devil. But both the Old and New Testaments indicate that the principal three-fold sphere of Satan's activities is heaven, the atmosphere, and the earth--not hell.¹ However, there are several statements in this passage which do owe their origin to the Bible, or to Biblical teaching. The "cunning fiend" is a statement consistent with the portrayal of the cleverness of Satan, who is referred to as "subtil" (Gen. 3:1; cf. Rev. 12:9; 2 Cor. 11:3; 2:11). "Glist'ring

semblance of piety" reminds us of 2 Corinthians 11:13-15: "Such . . . false apostles . . . transform themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." That a demon "should with his lion gait walk the whole world" is certainly an idea traceable to 1 Peter 5:8: "Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour." The thought of him walking "the whole world" is not clearly a part of 1 Peter 5:8, but it is a procedure attributed to Satan in Job 1:7: "And the LORD said unto Satan, 'Whence comest thou?' Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, 'From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.'" Tartar does not appear in the King James Version, nor in either the Geneva or Bishops' Bibles; it is the rendering of the Greek Tartarus, translated hell in 2 Peter 2:4, the only time the word appears in the New Testament: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [Tartarus], and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." In this verse Tartarus is definitely a place where sinful angels are confined, awaiting judgment. Joseph Henry Thayer, the great lexicographer of the Greek New Testament, says this about it: "Tartarus [is] the name of a subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead, where they suffer punishment for their

evil deeds; it answers to the Gehenna of the Jews."² Shakespeare makes Henry believe that Tartar is the realm of legions of demons which, evidently, can come and go at will. That there are, scripturally, legions of demons is plain from this New Testament passage: "When [Jesus] went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils [Greek: demons] long time. . . . And Jesus asked him, saying, 'What is thy name?' And he said, 'Legion'; because many devils [Greek: demons] were entered into him" (Luke 8:27, 30).

Later in this same speech, Henry compares "this revolt" of the traitors to "another fall of man" (II:ii:142). The fall refers to man's experience described in the third chapter of Genesis, when he plunged from a state of sinlessness and innocency to one of sinfulness and guilt as a result of succumbing to Satan's temptation to disobey God and eat of the forbidden fruit from "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."³ While the term itself is not found in Scripture, it is scriptural; the phrase is nearest approximated in Acts 1:25, where we read that "Judas by transgression fell." The writers of Scripture speak of man falling into sin,⁴ and they make much of the episode of the fall, but they refer to it in other terminology.⁵ Henry V is seen thinking of his three traitors as formerly so free of evil inclinations that treachery in them appears as shockingly surprising as pure Adam's deliberate defection from God to Satan.⁶

King Henry makes an interesting comment in III:iii:24-27:

We may as bootless spend our vain command
Upon th' enraged soldiers in their spoil
As send precepts to the leviathan⁷
To come to shore.

We cannot seem to know exactly what creature "the leviathan" is. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary says, under leviathan, that the Biblical reference is to "an aquatic monster interpreted variously as a crocodile (Job xli. 1-8, Ps. lxxiv. 14), a whale (Ps. civ. 26), as a dragon (Job iii. 8 R.V., Is. xxvii. 1)." So it is not likely that Shakespeare knew the meaning of the word. Whence, then, this utterance of King Henry? It would seem that a knowledge of Job 41:1-10 is the source: "Canst thou draw out leviathan with a hook? . . . Wilt thou take him for a servant for ever? . . . None is so fierce that dare stir him up."

Scene Three of Act Three finds King Henry before the gates of Harfleur, pleading with the governor and some citizens on the walls above to surrender the city peaceably and so spare the inhabitants from being ravaged. If Harfleur is not surrendered, among the other horrors which, Henry says, the English troops will inflict upon the townspeople is this:

Your naked infants [will be] spitted upon pikes,
Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confus'd
Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen.

(III:iii:38-41)

In these lines definite reference is made to the slaughter of the innocent children by Herod the Great at the time of Jesus' birth.

Shakespeare calls those who executed Herod's command "bloody-hunting slaughtermen." The cries of the bereft French mothers will compare with the wails which the Jewish mothers made over the loss of their babes. The relevant passage from the Evangelist Matthew is as follows:

Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, "In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning. Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not."

(Mat. 2:16-18)

The opening Scene of Act Four contains some significant statements by Henry V. First, in lines 174-77, he says: "Now, if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to fly from God." "They have no wings to fly from God"; could not this thought be from that great passage on God's omnipresence in Psalm 139:7-10? There the psalmist is speaking of the inability of wings to lend flight from God: "If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me" (vv. 9-10).

A few lines later Henry goes on to say:

Every subject's duty is
the King's; but every subject's soul is his own.

Therefore should every soldier in the wars do as every sick man in his bed, wash every mote out of his conscience; and dying so, death is to him advantage; or not dying, the time was blessedly lost wherein such preparation was gained; and in him that escapes, it were not sin to think that, making God so free an offer, He let him outlive that day to see His greatness and to teach others how they should prepare.

(IV:i:185-96)

It is hard to know how much of this language may be resting upon the Bible. To say that "every subject's soul is his own" may mean that each person is himself accountable to God; if this is the meaning of the statement here, then it is in accord with what Paul said in Romans 14:12, that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God"; but we cannot say for sure whether or not Shakespeare had this verse in mind when he penned this expression. To "wash every mote out of his conscience" is Henry's conception of man's best preparation for death. And even though this cleansing is evidently something each man can do for himself, no hint is made here as to how a man may so wash his conscience. But Henry goes on to say that for one so cleansed, "death is to him advantage." In similar language the Apostle Paul also wrote regarding death. Contemplating his own possible execution, he spoke of death as an advantageous departure: "I am in a strait betwixt two [the desire to live and the desire to die], having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better" (Phil. 1:23). Maybe this verse is the basis of Henry's statement about death being advantageous to the man whose conscience is clear and clean. Further

evidence that Shakespeare may have been meditating upon this passage in Philippians when he wrote this speech of King Henry seems plausible by comparing the succeeding remarks of both Paul and Henry, as they are in the same sequence. While Paul is in a quandary to know whether he should choose life or death, he says that although death would be a personal gain, yet for him to live would mean that he would be able to continue to help others; as he says: "[For me] to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith" (Phil. 1:24-25). Accordingly, Henry says that a conscience-clean soldier, if spared death, can likewise live to help others: "[To] him that escapes [death] . . . [God lets] him outlive that day to see His greatness and to teach others how they should prepare."

For our last instance of Henry's allusion to Scripture, we note his words following victory in battle:

O God, thy arm was here,
And not to us, but to thy arm alone,
Ascribe we all!

(IV:viii:111-13)

Are not these words akin to those of the psalmist in Psalm 144:3? "They got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them: but thy right hand, and thine arm." The marvelous victory of Henry's forces--with so great loss to their enemies and so little loss to themselves--may have reminded the king of some of the victories which the Lord gave Israel over

their enemies; for example, over the Assyrians, when in one night a smiting angel destroyed 185,000 of them (2 Kings 19:35; Isa. 37:36).

As Uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury

From the lips of the Archbishop of Canterbury we should expect to hear utterances of Scripture; yet, surprisingly enough, in this drama his references to the Bible are comparatively few. While he has somewhat to say, in short compass, about religious matters, he does not quote much Scripture. He speaks of "the Church" (I: i:10), but he is talking about the English Church, not the Church in the scriptural sense of a spiritual body. The Bishop of Ely responds and calls King Henry "a true lover of the holy Church" (I: i:23); but he, too, is using "the holy Church" in the sense of an earthly corporation to which "temporal lands . . . by testament have [been] given" (I: i:9-10). In Ephesians the Apostle Paul says that "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; . . . that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:25, 27). While there are grounds for calling it "the holy Church," we can hardly say that either Ely or Canterbury had such Scripture in mind when they speak of the Church. In the following lines, however, we do find the Archbishop of Canterbury making definite allusions to Biblical matters:

The courses of his [Henry's] youth promis'd it not.
The breath no sooner left his father's body,
But that his wildness, mortifi'd in him,

Seem'd to die too; yea, at that very moment
 Consideration like an angel came
 And whipp'd th' offending Adam out of him,
 Leaving his body as a paradise
 T' envelop and contain celestial spirits.
 Never was such a sudden scholar made;
 Never came reformation in a flood
 With such a heady currence, scouring faults;
 Nor never Hydra-headed wilfulness
 So soon did lose his seat, and all at once,
 As in this king.

(I:i:24-37)

Canterbury, speaking of that "reformation" which Henry experienced in 2 Henry IV, is attempting to explain it, or account for it. As we have said previously, there is nothing here or elsewhere which would satisfy us that Henry has been converted in the New Testament sense of the term. The Archbishop says that "Consideration . . . whipp'd th' offending Adam out of him." Where in Scripture can we find Consideration given such power? Albeit, "th' offending Adam" is a phrase which encompasses Bible doctrine, even though the Scriptures never state it in these exact words. Following the Fall, Adam (and Eve, as well) was driven out of the Edenic Paradise: "So he [the LORD God] drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen. 3:24). The sinful nature acquired as a result of the Fall has been labeled the Adamic nature; but in Scripture it is referred to by Paul as the "old man" (Romans 6:6; Col. 3:9) and the "natural man" (1 Cor. 2:14). It is this corrupt nature which Canterbury says was "whipp'd . . . out" of Henry V. The Apostle Paul tells

Christians to "mortify [A.S.V.: put to death] . . . your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry" (Col. 3:5); and it is to this verse (or the parallel one in Romans 8:13) that the Archbishop must be referring when he says of Henry, "His wildness, mortifi'd in him, / Seem'd to die too."

The Archbishop's next clear use of Scripture is in the following Scene:

The sin upon my head, dread sovereign!
For in the book of Numbers is it writ,
When the man dies, let the inheritance
Descend unto the daughter.

(I:ii:97-100)

While "the sin upon my head" may have but slight allusion to the cry of the mob before Pilate--"His [Christ's] blood be on us, and on our children" (Mat. 27:25)--the next utterance is a definite reference to Numbers 27:8: "If a man die, and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter." The complete Bible portion contains the first eleven verses of this chapter of Numbers, and deals with the case of the daughters of Zelophehad, here quoted in part by the Archbishop to justify Henry's claim to the realm of France.

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

Falstaff, who has been glibly but appropriately quoting Scripture throughout First and Second Henry IV, conforms with this practice even to the end, as seen in the Hostess' report of his death:

Pistol. Falstaff he is dead,
And we must ern therefore.

Bardolph. Would I were with him, wheresome'er he
is, either in heaven or in hell!

Hostess. Nay, sure, he's not in hell. He's in Ar-
thur's bosom, if ever man went to Arthur's bosom.
'A made a finer end and went away an it had been
any christom child. 'A parted even just between
twelve and one, even at the turning o'th' tide:
for after I saw him fumble with the sheets, and
play with flowers, and smile upon his fingers'
ends, I knew there was but one way; for his nose
was as sharp as a pen, and 'a babbled of green
fields.

(II:iii:5-18)

The Hostess reveals her lack of clear knowledge of Scripture when she bungles Abraham's bosom (Luke 16:23)--considered a name for the place of the righteous dead⁸--by calling it "Arthur's bosom." However, Shakespeare's audiences must have been conversant enough with the Bible to recognize the allusion and enjoy the humour the garbled term provided. In reporting Falstaff's death, the Hostess says that he "babbled of green fields," which expression doubtless is a reference to the "green pastures" of Psalm 23. Heretofore Falstaff has not quoted the Bible with any reverence, yet always his allusions have been apropos, as is his use of this Psalm when dying, for Psalm 23 has probably brought consolation to more dying people than any other portion of the Scripture.

A little later the Hostess says that Falstaff "talk'd of the whore of Babylon" (II:iii:40-41), mentioned in Revelation 17:1, 5: "I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters. . . . Upon her forehead was a name

written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." The appropriateness of this quotation by Falstaff, as reported by the Hostess, fits in with his previous talk about women; the transition to "the whore of Babylon" seems clear enough.

While Fluellen frequently brings God's name into his conversation, and makes an occasional reference to something else in the Bible--like the devil (IV:vii:144)--he uses no Scripture. There is, however, one point which we wish to note, namely, that he reveals Shakespeare's readiness to bring in again the thought of washing blood with water. Previously we have observed the poet's use of Pilate's hand-washing scene.⁹ There is no reference to that here, but the idea is apparent as Fluellen remarks to the King: "All the water in Wye cannot wash your Majesty's Welsh plood out of your pody, I can tell you that" (IV:vii:111-13).

Two of Williams' remarks may allude to Scripture. He makes reference to resurrection and judgment at the last day, saying: "But if the cause be not good, the King himself hath a heavy reckoning to make, when all those legs and arms and heads, chopp'd off in a battle, shall join together at the latter day" (IV:i:140-43). The idea of resurrection could have been impressed upon Shakespeare by repeated recitals of The Apostles' Creed in worship services; but its "resurrection of the dead" does not seem to be as close to the wording of Williams' utterance as Martha's words to Jesus in

John 11:24: "I know that he [her brother Lazarus] shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." In this passage "the last day" is associated with the resurrection, even as "the latter day" is in Williams' comment. Of course we have no further evidence that Williams was referring to or thinking of this verse, or a similar one; we treat the utterance here simply because it is in keeping with such Scriptures. Then, later in this same Act, Williams says: "All offences, my lord, come from the heart" (IV:viii:49). The grounds for this assertion may have been from knowledge from some source other than the Bible, yet the statement closely resembles the words of Jesus in Mark 7:21-23: "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, . . . : all these evil things come from within, and defile the man."

The only use the French Dauphin makes of the Bible is to render 2 Peter 2:22 in French, thus:

Constable. I could make as true a boast as that,
if I had a sow to my mistress.

Dauphin. "Le chien est retourné à son propre vomissement, et la truie lavée au boubier." Thou mak'st use of anything.

(III:vii:66-70)

In English the Biblical passage reads: "But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, 'The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire!'"

In reply to Pistol's remark, "Let us to France; like horse-leeches, my boys, / To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck!" (II:iii:57-58), the Boy says: "And that's but unwholesome food, they say" (lines 59-60). Who "they" are that say blood is an "unwholesome food," the Boy's comment does not indicate; he may be uttering some current expression, but, on the other hand, "they say" may refer to the Scriptures, or to some people whom he has heard quote the Scriptures, for blood is by the Bible forbidden food. It was proscribed in the Old Testament, as Leviticus 19:26 declares: "Ye shall not eat any thing with the blood"; it also is prohibited in the New Testament: "We write unto them [Gentile Christians] that they abstain . . . from blood" (Acts 15:20).

Thus have we worked through Henry V for allusions made to the Scriptures. Those more conversant with both Shakespeare's drama and the Bible may be able to discover more references than we have discussed in this chapter, but we feel that our efforts have yielded a harvest well worth the gleaning.

THE SCRIPTURES IN THE THREE HENRY VI PLAYS

The three Henry VI dramas we shall treat as a unit, since there is not adequate material in any one to justify a separate treatment of each. These plays, while productive of some salient portions pertinent to our study, contain comparatively few scriptural references.

As Uttered by Henry VI

Throughout these plays King Henry VI is consistently presented as one "famed for mildness, peace, and prayer" (3 Henry VI II:i:156), one who to the end preferred to

lead a private life
And in devotion spend my latter days
To sin's rebuke and my Creator's praise.

(3 Hen. VI IV:vi:42-44)

Of him his wife, Queen Margaret, said:

His champions are the prophets and apostles,
His weapons holy saws of sacred writ.

(2 Hen. VI I:iii:60-61)

It is quite natural, therefore, that we should expect to find him making repeated allusions to the Scriptures and to religious ideas. Yet the first of these three plays yields but one statement from his lips with any possible connection with the Bible, and that utterance is this:

I always thought
 It was both impious and unnatural
 That such immanity and bloody strife
 Should reign among professors of one faith.

(1 Hen. VI V:i:11-14)

It is the "professors of one faith" that catches our attention, for in Ephesians 4:5 the Apostle Paul uses that same phrase: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Both France and England at this time embrace Roman Catholicism, but the two countries are on the verge of war. When "a goodly peace" is suggested by "the Pope, / The Emperor, and the Earl of Armagnac" (1 Hen. VI V:i:1-5), Gloucester agrees that such procedure is "the only means / To stop effusion of our Christian blood" (lines 8-9). And it is in reply to this suggestion that King Henry draws upon that Biblical concept of Christian unity expressed by "one faith."

The next utterance which we note, which is the first in 2 Henry VI, is not actually a scriptural quotation but an expression of Henry's belief in God as Creator: "See how God in all His creatures works!" (II:i:7). But a few lines further the King moves out of the sphere of the general and makes a specific, unmistakable quotation from the Bible, namely, "Blessed are the peacemakers on earth" (II:i:35), which is a Beatitude lifted from Christ's famous Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are the peacemakers" (Mat. 5:9). A few speeches later, when Henry says that "to believing souls [God] / Gives light in darkness" (II:i:66-67), he may be thinking of 2 Corinthians 4:6: "God, who commanded the light to shine out of dark-

ness, hath shined in our hearts." And further in this same Scene,

King Henry says:

O God, what mischief work the wicked ones,
Heaping confusion on their own heads thereby!

(II:i:186-87)

How close these lines are to Psalm 7:16: "His mischief shall return upon his own head."¹

In support of his own kingship and in condemnation of the regal aspirations of Eleanor, Gloucester's wife, King Henry says to her and to her collaborators--witch Margery Jordan, Hume, Southwell, and Bolingbroke:

Stand forth, Dame Eleanor Cobham, Gloucester's wife.
In sight of God and us, your guilt is great.
Receive the sentence of the law for sins
Such as by God's book are adjudg'd to death.
You four, from hence to prison back again;
From thence unto the place of execution.
The witch in Smithfield shall be burn'd to ashes,
And you three shall be strangled on the gallows.
You, madam, for you are more nobly born,
Despoiled of your honour in your life,
Shall, after three days' open penance done,
Live in your country here in banishment,
With Sir John Stanley, in the Isle of Man.

(2 Hen. VI II:iii:1-13)

While it is clear that "God's book" (line 4) is the Bible, it is not clear to what passage, or passages, reference is made when Henry says that rebellion against the king is "adjudg'd to death." "Sins / Such as by God's book are adjudg'd to death" may have reference to the sin of witchcraft, for this practice is strictly condemned by the Bible. For example, in Exodus 22:18 we read: "Thou

shalt not suffer a witch to live"; and again, Lev. 20:27, "A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death." While these Scriptures explain why Margery Jordan, "The witch in Smithfield, shall be burned to ashes" (line 7), they do not seem adequate to account for the death sentence pronounced upon Southwell, Hume, and Bolingbroke, and the banishment of Eleanor, the Duchess of Gloucester, even though these last four are guilty of consorting with the witch (2 Hen. VI I:iv:1-81). True, the Bible contains numerous instances of traitors punished by death,² yet such illustrations are not proof that God commanded this action. According to Figgis, one of the propositions of the theory of the divine right of kings is that "under any circumstances resistance to a king is a sin, and ensures damnation."³ The strongest Bible Passage Figgis quotes as supporting this view is Romans 13:1-2:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.
For there is no power but of God: the powers that
be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore re-
sisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God:
and they that resist shall receive to themselves
damnation.

Even though damnation has been modified by being rendered judgement in many versions (Geneva, A.S.V., and R.S.V.; Bishops' reads damna-
tion), Figgis says that "it was held of great importance to main-
tain that *xpians* meant damnation in the strict sense."⁴ Even so,
damnation by God does not justify execution by man.

In 2 Henry VI II:iii:24, the King says: "God shall be my
hope." Again in IV:iv:55 he uses a similar expression: "God, our

hope." Although we cannot be sure that he was thinking of any particular verse of Scripture when he used these words, yet they may have been his recollection of such passages as these: "For thou art my hope, O Lord GOD" (Psa. 71:5); "the LORD will be the hope of his people" (Joel 3:16); "God . . . our hope" (1 Tim. 1:1). But in this speech (II:iii:24-25), Henry not only says that "God shall be my hope," he goes right on to say that God will also be "My stay, my guide, and lantern to my feet"; these expressions are also found in Scripture. Twice the Bible reports King David as saying, "The LORD was my stay" (2 Sam. 22:19; Psa. 18:18). Also in the Psalms are several recognitions of God as guide: in Psalm 31:3 David says: "For thy name's sake lead me, and guide me"; in 32:8 David reports God as saying to him: "I will guide thee with mine eye"; and the writer of Psalm 48:14 declares of God that "He will be our guide even unto death." Finally, Henry's use of "lantern" may take us back again to the passage in 2 Samuel, where David sings, "For thou art my lamp, O LORD" (22:29). In fact, since King Henry's utterances here follow the dismissal of Gloucester as the youthful king's protector--whom Henry was inclined to consider an enemy--it may be that Henry had this entire psalm of David in mind, for 2 Samuel 22 (which is closely followed in Psalm 18) is prefaced with this introduction: "David spake unto the LORD the words of this song in the day that the LORD had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul" (2 Sam. 22:1; cf. introduction to Psalm 18).

Since we have already called attention to the place in this thesis where we deal with the theory of the divine right of kings,⁵ we shall merely note here that Henry recognizes himself as God's deputy: "By His majesty I swear, / Whose far unworthy deputy I am" (2 Hen. VI III:ii:285-86). Nevertheless, in the next play when he is bemoaning his dethronement, he says to himself: "Thy balm wash'd off wherewith thou wast anointed" (3 Hen. VI III:i:17). How different is this sentiment from that voiced by Richard II!

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.

(Richard II III:ii:54-57)

"We are sinners all" (2 Hen. VI III:iii:31), or some such similar cry, could easily come from the knowledge of a stereotype confession; yet when meditative Henry uses it there is just the possibility that he could have had in mind a Scripture like Romans 3:23: "All have sinned"; or Ecclesiastes 7:20: "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not."

Warned by Clifford to "Expect your Highness' doom, of life or death" (2 Hen. VI IV:ix:12), in the next two lines Henry replies: "Then, heaven, set ope thy everlasting gates / To entertain my vows of thanks and praise!" If the King were acquainted with the Twenty-Fourth Psalm, he might have been thinking of verses 7 and 9:

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye
lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King

of glory shall come in.

.

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift
them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King
of glory shall come in.

Any religious person might say, "The will of the Lord be done," yet have no definite Bible verse in mind. In the same way, no Bible portion may be in mind when King Henry says: "And what God will, that let your king perform; / And what He will, I humbly yield unto" (3 Hen. VI III:i:100-01). However, we call attention to this utterance by Henry because it may simulate Christ's well-known cry in the Garden of Gethsemene: "Not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). In like fashion we call attention to the similarity between Henry's "my Creator" (3 Hen. VI IV:vi:44) and "thy Creator" (Eccl. 12:1). But this next, the last, utterance of Henry's which we here consider comes much nearer to the Bible. When the King says: "So flies the reckless shepherd from the wolf" (3 Hen. VI V:vi:7), he echoes the words of Jesus in John 10:13: "The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep."

As Uttered by Queen Margaret

Margaret, Henry's Queen, makes several statements which may have relationship to Scripture, so we shall examine them. Slightly she speaks of her husband as one whose "champions are the prophets and apostles" (2 Hen. VI I:iii:60). Next, she may have been prompted by a knowledge of Matthew 7:15--"Beware of

false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves"--when she says: "Is he [Gloucester] a lamb? His skin is surely lent him, / For he's inclin'd as is the ravenous wolf" (2 Hen. VI III:i:77-78). Psalm 58:5 speaks of 'the deaf adder,' and Margaret rebukes Henry with, "What! art thou like the adder, waxen deaf?" (2 Hen. VI III:ii:76). The psalmist declares that "the wicked are . . . like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear; which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely" (Psalm 58:3-5), That is, the wicked will strike with deadly venom irrespective of what may be done to stop them. While Margaret's remark may have been inspired by a knowledge of this portion from the Psalms, she applies it differently. She thinks that her husband has become so stunned by the news of Gloucester's death that he cares not for her welfare. As King Henry seems deaf to her efforts to gain his ear to listen to her appeals for sympathy, Margaret lashes out: "What! art thou, like the adder, waxen deaf? / Be poisonous too and kill thy forlorn queen" (2 Hen. VI III:ii:76-77). Her fourth quotation that we use is, doubtless, a definite reference to the Biblical "new Jerusalem" (Rev. 21:2), or "the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22). As Oxford and Somerset are led away to death, Margaret laments: "So part we sadly in this troublous world, / To meet with joy in sweet Jerusalem" (3 Hen. VI V:v:7-8). Queen Margaret's mockery of York (3 Hen. VI I:iv:86-102) could have been drawn after the mock-crowning of Christ (Mat. 27:27-30); but as this analogy may be too forced, we merely call attention to two events.

As Uttered by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester

Like Margaret, Gloucester also likely refers to Matthew 7:15--about the wolf in sheep's clothing--when he rightly labels his uncle, the Bishop of Winchester, "thou wolf in sheep's array"⁶ (1 Henry VI I:iii:55). His cry "so help you righteous God!" (1 Hen. VI IV:i:8) may be from his knowledge that God is a righteous God;⁷ yet "righteous God" is a phrase found in Psalm 7:9. However, the expression is too brief to permit proof that Gloucester was quoting Scripture when he used it. As we have noted, since Shakespeare's language often parallels and approximates Scripture, it is difficult to know every time he is indebted to the Bible for expressions similar to those in the Bible. Here is an example of such a case. Jacob said: "Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave" (Gen. 42:38). Was Shakespeare thinking of this when he made Gloucester cry, "Ah, Humphrey, this dishonour in thine age / Will bring thy head with sorrow to the ground!" (2 Hen. VI II:iii:18-19)? Since ground here means grave, the similarity is striking. And since both the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles read head rather than hairs (the A. V. rendering), the possibility of Shakespeare's debt to the Bible in this instance is increased.

As Uttered by Henry Beaufort, Bishop of
Winchester and Later Cardinal Beaufort

From such a religious man as Henry Beaufort we should expect to find numerous references to the Bible; but he does not

allude to it more than about four times. In Revelation 17:14 and 19:16 Jesus is referred to by the title "King of kings"; so the Bishop of Winchester says that King Henry the Fifth was "a king bless'd of the King of kings" (1 Hen. VI I;i:28). Three lines later in the same speech he says that "The battles of the Lord of hosts he fought." The Scriptures make frequent mention of the "Lord of hosts."⁸ Next, the Bishop calls our attention to Cain and Abel, Adam and Eve's first two sons (Gen. 4:1-2), as he says to Gloucester:

I will not budge a foot.
This be Damascus,⁹ be thou cursed Cain
To slay thy brother Abel, if thou wilt.

(1 Hen. VI I:iii:38-40)

And, finally, as Cardinal Beaufort, in an aside to Gloucester he says in Latin: "Medice, teipsum--" (2 Hen. VI II:i:53); which is taken from Luke 4:23: "Physician, heal thyself." We cannot explain the paucity of Beaufort's Scripture quotations on the ground that he was a hypocrite, for the later Duke of Gloucester, who becomes Richard III, was surely hypocritical, and yet he makes repeated references to the Bible, as we shall see in our next section.

As Uttered by Richard, the Duke of Gloucester,
Who Later Becomes Richard III

In the Henry VI plays we shall examine seven utterances of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, who later becomes Richard III. Of these passages three bear directly upon Scripture, while four are perhaps nothing more than intimations of scriptural ideas. When

Richard speaks to Young Clifford, predicting the latter's death, saying, "You shall sup with Jesu Christ to-night" (2 Hen. VI V: i:214), he is thinking of the words in Revelation 3:20, where Christ says, "I . . . will sup with him, and he with me." Although Christ's words are usually interpreted as an invitation to salvation--a request that the sinner open the door of his heart to receive the Saviour--Richard speaks these words and associates them with death. Next, in 3 Henry VI IV:i:21-22, Richard scornfully answers his brother, Edward IV, thus:

No, God forbid that I should wish them sever'd
Whom God hath join'd together.

The concept that in true marriage God joins the man and woman dates back to the account of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:18, 21-24), is affirmed by Jesus (Mat. 19:6; Mk. 10:9), and reaffirmed by the Apostle Paul (Eph. 5:31). Either one of the Gospel accounts will suffice to indicate the words of Jesus which Richard quotes, but we use the passage found in Mark 10:6-9:

From the beginning of the creation God made them
[man and wife] male and female. For this cause
shall a man leave his father and mother, and
cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one
flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one
flesh. What therefore God hath joined together,
let not man put asunder.

The third instance of Richard's clear reference to the Bible is found in 3 Henry VI V:vii:33-34. King Edward IV has asked his brothers, Clarence and Richard, to kiss their "princely nephew" (line 27), the young Prince Edward. Each brother does so, but no

sooner has Richard kissed the child than he utters in an aside these words:

To say the truth, so Judas kiss'd his master
And cried, "All hail!" whenas he meant all harm.

If the parallel accounts from Scripture need to be produced to prove the source of Richard's words just quoted, we can find them in the betrayal records in the Gospels;¹⁰ as translated in the King James Version, the record in Matthew is nearest that of Richard: "He [Judas] came to Jesus, and said, 'Hail, master'; and kissed him" (Mat. 26:49). If this verse was the one Shakespeare had in mind, then he was influenced by the Bishops' Bible, for in Mat. 26:49 it reads: "Haile master"; Genevan translators rendered it: "God save thee, Master."

In the following four passages the relationship to the Scriptures is not so marked as in those already treated, yet they are worthy of brief consideration. "Priests pray for enemies" (2 Hen. VI V:ii:71) may be nothing more than a statement of what they were actually known to do; but the commandment to "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Mat. 5:44) is part of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Next, Richard speaks of God as Creator when he swears vengeance upon Clifford: "By Him that made us all, I am resolv'd / That Clifford's manhood lies upon his tongue" (3 Hen. VI II:ii:124). Again in 3 Henry VI Gloucester says:

Suspicion always haunts the guilty mind,
The thief doth fear each bush an officer.

(V:vi:11-12)

If this speech was not prompted by a knowledge of Scripture, it at least expresses the same truth as that found in Proverbs 28:1: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." Finally, Richard may have had in mind "God is love" (1 John 4:8) when he said, "This word 'love,' . . . greybeards call divine" (3 Hen. VI V:vi:81); of course, on the other hand, he may have known nothing of this verse in the Bible, but was, as he says, quoting the "greybeards." However, directly or indirectly, the Biblical teaching is injected into this utterance of Richard.

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

Scattered throughout the three Henry VI plays are a number of allusions to the Scriptures; since, however, most of these are limited to but single utterances by a wide variety of individuals, we cannot group them in any special order.

In the French camp only three allude to Scripture: Charles, Alencon, and Pucelle. Charles speaks of "the sword of Deborah" (1 Hen. VI I:ii:105), "Saint Philip's daughters" (Ibid. I:ii:143), and "Hell our prison is" (Ibid. IV:vii:58). Deborah was one of the judges of Israel whose rule is recorded in the fourth and fifth chapters of the book of the Judges. With the help of the military commander, Barak, her forces were victorious over the Canaanite army under the leadership of Sisera; but the King James Version

does not mention the word sword in connection with Deborah.

Philip had four daughters and was one of the seven deacons chosen by the Church at Jerusalem (Acts 6:1-6). Later he became an evangelist and was visited by the Apostle Paul:

The next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came unto Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.

(Acts 21:8-9)

The translators who gave us the King James Version, as well as those responsible for the Geneva and Bishops' versions, rendered different Greek words by the English term hell,¹¹ thus confusing the reader. So while there is no exact Bible verse which calls hell a prison, this idea may have risen from the rendering of 2 Peter 2:4: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [Greek: Tartarus], and delivered them into chains of darkness." Of course the general conception of hell as a prison is well known apart from any specific reference to Scripture to support it.

Alencon thinks that the English soldiers are "Samsons and Goliases" (1 Hen. VI I:ii:33), the mighty men of the Old Testament (Judges 13-16; 1 Samuel 17).

The Apostle John in his gospel account relates several occasions when Christ's escape from a premature death was explained on the grounds that "His hour was not yet come" to die (John 7:30;

8:20, cf. 13:1: "When Jesus knew that his hour was come"). Joan la Pucelle makes the same explanation for Talbot's escape from her sword: "Talbot, farewell; thy hour is not yet come" (1 Hen. VI I:v:13).

Salisbury's utterance that "Pride went before, ambition follows him" (2 Hen. VI I:i:180) may have had some connection with the Biblical proverb, "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" (Prov. 16:18); on the other hand, his words may have come from the knowledge of some other maxim on pride. Indefinite as this last reference may be, Salisbury, a few lines earlier in the Scene, comes out with this significant line: "By the death of Him that died for all" (line 113). There can be no mistaking the similarity of these words with the following expressions of Scripture: "one died for all; . . . he died for all; . . . unto him which died for them" (2 Cor. 5:14-15), and, "We see Jesus . . . that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9). In this same play Warwick also makes an important statement regarding the atonement:

As surely as my soul intends to live
With that dread King that took our state upon him
To free us from His father's wrathful curse.

(2 Hen. VI III:ii:153-55)

This is a beautiful expression of the redemptive work of Christ. It might well be quoted as a commentary upon the Apostle Paul's words: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his

Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law. . . . Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. 4:4-5; 3:13). Warwick also says that "Measure for measure"¹² must be answered" (3 Hen. VI II:vi:55); "measure for measure" quite likely comes from Christ's words in Luke 6:38: "For with the same measure that ye mete withall it shall be measured to you again." Here Shakespeare approximates the Bishops' rendering rather than the Genevan; Bishops': "with the same measure that ye mete withall, it shall be measured to you againe"; Geneva: "for with what measure ye mete, with the same shall men mete to you againe."

Regarding "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," the Apostle Peter gives us these graphic lines:

The heavens and the earth, which are now . . . are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. . . . all these things shall be dissolved, . . . the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.

(2 Peter 3:7, 10-12)

It is of this destruction that Young Clifford speaks when he says:

O, let the vile world end,
And the premised flames of the last day
Knit earth and heaven together!
Now let the general trumpet blow his blast.

(2 Hen. VI V:ii:40-43)

That events of the last days will be accompanied by a trumpet blast is also teaching gathered from Scripture: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God" (1 Thes. 4:16); "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised" (1 Cor. 15:52); "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound [his trumpet], the mystery of God should be finished" (Rev. 10:7).

When York speaks of "my blood upon your heads" (3 Hen. VI I:iv:168), he is saying that the guilt for his death will rest upon the "hard-hearted Clifford" (line 167) who has threatened him. The Jews who demanded of Pilate the death of Jesus signified the same responsibility when they cried: "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Mat. 27:25). This rabble cry may have inspired York's utterance. York also talks of the divine right of kings, when he champions the legal right of the House of York against the House of Lancaster. To King Henry VI, York says: "By heaven, thou shalt rule no more / O'er him whom heaven created for thy ruler" (2 Hen. VI V:i:104-5). King Edward IV also thinks of God having a definite hand in kingship when he addresses Him as "Thou setter up and plucker down of kings" (3 Hen. VI II:iii:37). Edward's remark may have even a closer relationship to the Bible, for his thought of God setting up one and pulling down another comes close to the thought expressed in Psalm 75:6-7; "For promotion

cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another." The words King Nebuchadnezzar heard in one of his dreams may also have been at the back of York's declaration, for Nebuchadnezzar thought he heard God saying: "The most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:17).

Cade says that "Adam was a gardener" (2 Hen. VI IV:ii:142). There is in Genesis 2:15 the account of the Lord putting Adam "into the garden of Eden to dress it and keep it." When Jephthah was called to judge Israel and lead an army against the Ammonites, he "vowed a vow unto the LORD, and said, 'If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the LORD's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering" (Judges 11:30-31). But when he returned in victory, "behold, his daughter came out to meet him, . . . and she was his only child" (v. 34). Clarence says that it would have been much better had Jephthah broken than kept such a rash vow, but he puts it in these words: "To keep that oath were more impiety / Than Jephthah's when he sacrific'd his daughter" (3 Hen. VI V:i:90-91).¹³

The Duchess of Gloucester makes an indirect but definite reference to the Ten Commandments when she says:

Could I come near your beauty with my nails,
I'd set my ten commandments in your face.

(2 Hen. VI I:iii:144-45)

Christ's giving of sight to a man who was born blind is the background of the whole ninth chapter of the Gospel According to John. This notable miracle was probably in mind when the following lines were penned, even though we know that in this case the flaunted miracle was a hoax:

Townsman. "A miracle!"
Gloucester. What means this noise?
Fellow, what miracle dost thou proclaim?
Towns. A miracle! a miracle!
Suffolk. Come to the King and tell him what
miracle.
Towns. Forsooth, a blind man at Saint Alban's
shrine,
Within this half-hour, hath receiv'd his sight;
A man that ne'er saw in his life before.
King. Now, God be prais'd, that to believing
souls
Gives light in darkness, comfort in despair!

(2 Hen. VI II:i:58-67)

The one who claims to have been healed is Simpox. When it is apparent that he is an impostor, Gloucester calls for a beadle to whip him; even though Simpox says that he is "not able to stand alone" (line 145), one lash from the whip sends him leaping over a stool and running away. Regarding this event the Cardinal and Suffolk comment as follows:

Car. Duke Humphrey has done a miracle today.
Suf. True; made the lame to leap and fly away.

(2 Hen. VI II:i:161-62)

Suffolk's remark may have been intended as a pun on Isaiah 35:6:
 "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart."

We cannot ascertain the source of the Mayor's words "more haughty than the devil" (1 Hen. VI I:iii:85); but the Apostle Paul says that a bishop must not be "a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6). This latter passage at least supports the Mayor's reference to the devil's haughtiness. In this same category is Lord Say's remark: "Ignorance is the curse of God, / Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven" (2 Hen. VI IV:vii:78-79). Were these words a reflection of anything in the Bible? Perhaps they were never intended to be so interpreted, yet the prophet Hosea quotes God as saying: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge" (Hosea 4:6).

In the course of this Henry VI trilogy there are references to the "devil" (1 Hen. VI I:v:5), "hell" (1 Hen. VI II:i:18), "Christian" (1 Hen. VI IV:ii:30), "Jesu" (2 Hen. VI I:i:161), "the grace of God" (2 Hen. VI I:ii:72), "God in mercy" (2 Hen. VI I:iii:160), and such like, which we have not considered to have close enough bearing on any particular Scripture to be dealt with one by one.

VI

THE SCRIPTURES IN RICHARD III

As Uttered by Richard, Duke of Gloucester,

Afterwards King Richard III

Despite his hypocrisy, Richard makes the most use of Scripture of any one in this play. His evil character and actions are not because he is ignorant of the Scriptures but in spite of his knowledge. Not always does he use some "piece of scripture . . . [to] clothe [his] naked villainy" (I:iii:334-36), for he has a conscience which at times rises to trouble him (V:iii:179-206). When he is not thinking of himself as "So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin" (IV:ii:65), we must credit him as sincere when he makes references to the Bible.

Richard's first allusion to the Scripture is in his utterance of his favourite oath, "by Saint Paul"¹ (I:i:138), which he repeatedly uses.² When he says to Queen Anne, "Lady, you know no rules of charity, / Which renders good for bad, blessings for curses" (I:ii:68-69), he is likely referring to Christ's teaching in His Sermon on the Mount: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you" (Mat. 5:44). In Act I he refers to Christ as "King of heaven" (I:ii:105), and as "Jesu" (I:iii:136; also V:iii:178), but neither of these titles is strictly Biblical; the Bible contains several references to Christ as the

"King of kings,"³ but never "King of heaven," and Jesus is always spelled out in full. This Act also contains Richard's well-known speech on finding some passage from the Bible with which to cloak his evil intentions:

But then I sigh, and, with a piece of scripture,
Tell them that God bids us do good for evil;
And thus I clothe my naked villainy
With odd old ends stol'n forth of holy writ,
And seem a saint when most I play the devil.⁴

(I:iii:334-38)

From the opening lines of this drama until Gloucester becomes Richard III, this son of York has but one ultimate goal in mind, the crown of England. Again and again he tries to deceive those about him, but never does he deceive either himself or the audience as to his motives. He is an avowed, out-and-out villain, quite willing to "seem a saint" but "play the devil." Intentionally he is quoting Scripture to camouflage his wicked purposes; here in this soliloquy he confesses to stealing "odd old ends [from] holy writ." One of these passages "stol'n forth" we have already noted (I:ii:68-69, cf. Mat. 5:44);⁵ now it is to this same Biblical passage that Richard is referring in this speech (I:iii:335) when he says that "God bids us do good for evil." However, it is rather significant that once he has thus quoted Scripture so as to "clothe [his] naked villainy," and that once he has admitted that he has done this, never again in this play do we find him repeating this type of thing. He makes further references to the Scriptures,

yet he does not employ them after this manner. Although he devises the death of his brother Clarence, and hypocritically says that "God will revenge it" (II:i:138), we cannot say that this statement of God's retribution is a quotation from the Bible.

The first possible reference Richard makes to Scripture in Act III is as follows:

No more can you distinguish of a man
Than of his outward show, which, God he knows,
Seldom or never jumpeth with the heart.

(III:i:9-11)

This passage is not so much couched in the language of Scripture as freighted with the thought of Scripture. Clear reference seems to be to the words of the Lord to Samuel, when the latter was sent to choose among the sons of Jesse a future king for Israel. When the prophet "looked on Eliab," David's oldest brother, he said, "'Surely the LORD's anointed is before him.'" But the LORD said unto Samuel, 'Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart'" (1 Sam. 16:6-7).

Richard's second possible reference to the Bible in Act III appears in these lines:

Thou [Hastings] art a traitor!
Off with his head! Now, by Saint Paul I swear,
I will not dine until I see the same.

(III:iv:77-79)

While we have previously pointed out that "by Saint Paul" is Richard's favourite oath, it is interesting to observe that here the phrase is immediately followed by a line telling us that Richard will not eat until the murder is done. Could there not be an allusion here to Acts 23:12? In this verse we read: "Certain of the Jews banded together and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul."

Perhaps we are not fully justified in calling attention here to the following lines, for they contain no quotation of Scripture; neither is there in them the affinity that the foregoing speeches bear to the Bible; however, these lines do accord with a definite principle found in Scripture, namely, that sin is progressive. Richard says: "I am in / So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin!" (IV:ii:64-65). From his own life David gives us a clear illustration of the downward progressiveness of sin. The sin of idleness kept him at home when he should have gone forth to war (2 Sam. 11:1). Idleness led to lust (2 Sam. 11:2), from which it was not a far step to adultery (2 Sam. 11:4). To cover his adultery David committed murder (2 Sam. 11:15). King Richard's expression is a statement of this principle; his life of bloody murders is an illustration of it, as the following long list of victims testifies: Henry VI, his son Prince Edward, Clarence, Rivers, Grey, Vaughan, Hastings, the two young sons of Edward IV, Lady Anne, and Buckingham.⁶

In this same Act IV, Richard also refers to "Abraham's bosom"⁷ (IV:iii:38), "the Lord's anointed"⁸ (IV:iv:150), and to the devil as the tempter⁹ (IV:iv:419). We have already treated elsewhere the first two scriptural terms, and later, under Queen Elizabeth's remarks, we shall treat the last.

Act V finds Richard making a few scattered remarks in Scene iii which may have a relationship to the Bible. "The King's name is a tower of strength" (line 12) is probably borrowed from Proverbs 18:10: "The name of the LORD is a strong tower." Richard speaks of death for George Stanely as a falling "Into the blind cave of eternal night" (line 62); such an expression may be a dramatic reference to the Biblical description of the wicked dead being "cast out into outer darkness" (Mat. 8:12). As Richard bemoans the overcast skies on the morning of the battle he is to fight against Richmond, he suddenly exclaims:

Why, what is that to me
More than to Richmond? for the self-same heaven
That frowns on me looks sadly upon him.

(V:iii:285-87)

This thought may have been prompted by a knowledge of Christ's words, also found in His Sermon on the Mount, "He [God] maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Mat. 5:45). The final quotation which we refer to from the lips of Richard III concerns his belief that at death men must go directly to either heaven or hell. Rejecting the gnawing pains of his conscience, he urges his comrades

on to war with a determination expressed thus: "Let us to 't pell-mell; / If not heaven, then hand in hand to hell" (V:iii:312-13). This utterance appears rather striking, not only because it is in keeping with Christ's words recorded in Matthew 25:46--"These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal"--but also because it is distinctly a Protestant belief expressed by a Catholic king; there is no indication here that Richard had any thought of souls at death going to any intermediate place like Purgatory.¹⁰

As Uttered by George, Duke of Clarence

Although Clarence showed himself fickle in the quickly-changing political situation of his day and indulged in some bloody deeds, of himself he says, "I am a Christian faithful man" (I:iv:4). His statement that in his dream "often did I strive / To yield the ghost" (I:iv:36-37), may have been based on the Bible expression describing death as yielding "up the ghost" or giving "up the ghost".¹¹

Clarence's most significant theological utterance is in this charge to his two murderers:

I charge you, as you hope to have redemption¹²
By Christ's dear blood shed for our grievous sins.

(I:iv:194-95)

In the plainest of terms Clarence speaks of redemption as being dependent upon Christ's taking upon himself man's sins and paying

the ransom price, the shedding of His "dear blood." This Biblical conception of salvation is consistently uttered by a number of Shakespeare's important characters. In the historical plays already considered, we have seen this voiced both by King Henry IV,¹³ and Warwick,¹⁴ and now by Clarence. In Measure for Measure Isabella utters it, too, as follows:

Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once;
And He that might the vantage best have took
Found out the remedy.

(II:ii:73-75)

Next, Clarence says:

Erroneous vassals! the great King of kings
Hath in the table of his¹⁵ law commanded
That thou shalt do no murder. Will you, then,
Spurn at His edict and fulfil a man's?
Take heed; for He holds vengeance in His hand,
To hurl upon their heads that break His law.

(I:iv:200-05)

"King of kings" is a title found in 1 Timothy 6:15: "Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings." "His law" might well refer to the whole of God's Word, yet in particular it must have reference here to the Ten Commandments, for Clarence definitely identifies them by the term "the table of his law." From these Commandments Clarence has isolated the Fifth--"Thou shalt not kill"--and worded it, "Thou shalt do no murder." This wording is, actually, a clarification of the command, for God's prohibition is not vaguely against killing but specifically against homicide. Clarence also refers to God as the great King of kings," a title the New Testament consistently applies to Christ,¹⁶ yet one which

Clarence applies to God the Father, or else he infers that the Ten Commandments are as much "the table" of Christ's law as "the table of the Father's. In this same speech Clarence may refer to still another Scripture. When he speaks of God holding "vengeance in His hand, / To hurl upon their heads that break His law," he may be basing his utterance on such an Old Testament passage as Deuteronomy 28:45:

All these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee.

"Make peace with God, for you must die, my lord," says the 2nd Murderer; to whom Clarence replies: "Have you that holy feeling in your souls / To counsel me to make my peace with God?" (I: iv:256-58). We may not be certain as to the origin of these references to "peace with God," but certainly the phrase itself is a scriptural one, even as the Apostle Paul writes: "We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

As Uttered by Edward IV

Seemingly only three references are made to the Bible by King Edward IV, and all of them are found in Act II. Perhaps we may not be justified in calling these references to the Bible, for there is no evidence that he had any specific Scripture in mind as he spoke on these occasions. These utterances of Edward are important, however, because of the recognition they make him give to Christ. Twice Edward speaks of Jesus as Redeemer. Having made

what he thinks is a successful reconciliation of the factious parties near the crown, he speaks of his approaching death in these words:

I every day expect an embassy
From my Redeemer to redeem me hence;
And more in peace my soul shall part to heaven
Since I have made my friends at peace on earth.

(II:i:3-6)

It is quite evident that "Redeemer" and "redeem" are used here in different senses. He must think of the first in its relationship to Christ's delivering him from the penalty of sin; the second with regard to Christ's deliverance of his soul from earth to heaven. Later, while reproving Derby for suing for pardon for his servant who has slain "a riotous gentleman" (line 100), Edward says:

. . . when your carters or your waiting-vassals
Have done a drunken slaughter, and defac'd
The precious image of our dear Redeemer,
You straight are on your knees for pardon, pardon.

(II:i:121-24)

This speech not only finds Edward again recognizing Christ as his Redeemer, but also speaking of man's having been made in the image of God--"The precious image of our dear Redeemer." This wording is rather interesting. Several times the Old Testament mentions man as having been made in the image of God: "God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.' . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him" (Gen. 1:26-27). Other affirmations of this fact are found in Genesis 9:6 and 1 Corinthians 11:7. However, never in so many words do we find in

the Bible the statement that man was made in Christ's image. Since Genesis 1:26-27 contains an intimation of the Trinity in the use of the terms us and our, it may be that Shakespeare admitted Christ as part of the Godhead and indirectly acknowledged this position by having Edward say that man was made in "The precious image of our dear Redeemer." Like other characters already quoted, King Edward also recognizes Christ as "He that is the supreme King of kings" (II:i:13).

As Uttered by Queen Elizabeth

That God is a just God is a doctrine which we have already spoken of as one taught in Scripture.¹⁷ This teaching Queen Elizabeth appears to accept when she says: "So just is God, to right the innocent" (I:iii:182). She, too, speaks of God, or Christ, as "the King's king"¹⁸ (IV:iv:346). But there are other portions of greater significance. One of these, however, is difficult; it concerns her remark to the Duchess of York to

. . . be brief,
That our swift-winged souls may catch the King's
[i.e., the deceased Edward's],
Or, like obedient subjects, follow him
To his new kingdom of ne'er-changing night.

(II:ii:43-45)

The text here is in great dispute; the part in question being "ne'er-changing night." The Folio, followed by Neilson and Hill, is strongly defended by S. W. Singer in his Text of Shakespeare Vindicated, 1853, p. 168, where he writes: "Nothing can be more certain than that Shakespeare wrote: 'ne'er changing night.'"¹⁹ Although the Quarto reads "perpetual rest," neither this nor the Folio rendering is as significant to our purpose as that in J. P.

Collier's MS. (1842?): "ne'er changing light" (Variorum, p. 165). Despite the fact that this last rendering seems to be most in keeping with the context, the possibility of this text being what Shakespeare actually wrote is slight. However, were it the correct reading, then Edward is spoken of as having departed "To his new kingdom of ne'er-changing light." From where could Shakespeare get this description of the heavenly kingdom if not from Revelation 21:2, 23, 25? There the Bible describes "the heavenly Jerusalem," "the holy city," as "the city [that] had no need of the sun neither of the moon, to shine in it: . . . for there shall be no night there."

As the idea of sheep and wolves is recurrent in the Bible,²⁰ so it is in Shakespeare.²¹ The following lines spoken by Queen Elizabeth finds the thought again repeated:

Wilt thou, O God, fly from such gentle lambs,
And throw them in the entrails of the wolf?

(IV:iv:22-23)

Another significant utterance by Elizabeth, which is her fifth and last reference to the Scriptures, is her recognition of the devil as the tempter: "Shall I be tempted of the devil thus?" (IV:iv:418). She may have had no particular Bible verse in mind when she thus spoke, but her use of "to be tempted of the devil" brings to our attention the very same phrase found in Matthew 4:1, concerning the temptation of Jesus: "Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil."

As Uttered by Lady Anne

Anne accepts the Bible truth that God made man, as seen in the line which asserts that God made King Henry VI, whose death she blames on Richard: "O God, which this blood mad'st, revenge his death!" (I:ii:62). When she berates Gloucester as King Henry's murderer, she says:

Avaunt, thou dreadful minister of hell!
Thou hadst but power over his mortal body,
His soul thou canst not have.

(I:ii:46-48)

Here her words are so akin to an utterance of Christ that a mere quoting of the latter's statement should be sufficient to note the parallel: "'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul'" (Mat. 10:28). Also in this same Scene she cries for the "earth [to] gape open wide and eat him quick" (I:ii:65). To one conversant with Scripture, this statement is reminiscent of the scene in the Old Testament where "the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods" (Numb. 16:32).²²

As Uttered by Miscellaneous Characters

In Act I, Queen Margaret's cry for "the worm of conscience [to] begnaw [Gloucester's] soul" (I:iii:222) may have been an utterance prompted by a knowledge of the scriptural description of hell as a place "where their worm dieth not" (Mark 9:44, 48; Isa. 66:24). "Their worm shall not die" is explained by a note in the margin of

the Geneva Bible opposite Isaiah 66:24 as "a continuall torment of conscience, which shall ever gnaw them, and never suffer them to rest"; then Mark 9:44 is cited as a cross reference. But as these Bible verses also go on to say, "and the fire is not quenched," so Margaret may also have had this second thought in mind when she says that "hell burns" (IV:iv:75). Later in this same Act the Murderers speak of "the great judgement day" (I:iv:106), "God's dreadful law" (I:iv:213-14), "snow in harvest"²³ (I:iv:255), and "Pilate" (I:iv:279). The Second Murderer's reference to Pilate gives Shakespeare another opportunity to play upon the hand-washing scene, which we have already noted to be one of his favourites:²⁴

A bloody deed, and desperately dispatch'd!
How fain, like Pilate, would I wash my hands
Of this most grievous murder!

(I:iv:278-80)

Also in this Act (I:iii:316-17), we find Rivers referring to Matthew 5:44--"Pray for them which despitefully use you"--as follows:

A virtuous and a Christian-like conclusion,
To pray for them that have done scathe to us.²⁵

Act II contains this striking quotation from the Bible: "Woe to that land that's govern'd by a child!" (II:iii:11), which is lifted from Ecclesiastes 10:16, a verse which reads: "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child."

Act III finds the Prince calling the judgment day "the general all-ending day" (III:i:78). Catesby says, "It is a reeling world" (III:ii:38), which statement compares with "the earth

shall reel to and fro" (Isa. 24:30. Hastings' simile of "a drunken sailor on a mast" (III:iv:101) may have come from Proverbs 23:31, 34: "Look not upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. . . . Thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast." Surely Solomon is speaking here of either "a drunken sailor on a mast" or the sensations of a drunken man.

Tyrrel, in Act IV, refers to God's original creation (Gen. 1-2) as "the prime creation" (IV:iii:19). And Buckingham, in Act V, speaks of "moody discontented souls [that] / Do through the clouds behold this present hour / Even for revenge mock my destruction!" (V:i:7-9). These lines seem akin to that description of souls in heaven awaiting vengeance:

"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?'"

(Rev. 6:9-10)

We have now worked through, not only Richard III, but all Shakespeare's historical plays which constitute an unbroken succession from Richard II to Richard III, examining them one by one to see how their various characters make references, directly or indirectly, actually or remotely, to the Scriptures.

VII

THE SCRIPTURES IN KING JOHN

In the other English historical plays by Shakespeare with which we have dealt, the dramatis personae have made sufficient references to the Bible--directly or indirectly--for us to deal, first with the utterances of the principal characters, then with those of the miscellaneous characters, but such is not the case with either King John or Henry VIII; neither of these plays yields enough material pertaining to our study to be dealt with after this manner. In King John all the characters combined make but few allusions to Scripture.

John, Arthur, Lewis, and Pandolph--factions representing England, France, and Rome--contend for the English throne,¹ and all are willing to appeal to or reject the divine right theory² as convenience (Commodity, III:i:561-98) dictates. But so far as allusions to the Scriptures are concerned, we can find King John himself making but two, and they are rather vague and uncertain, to say the least. Since the Apostle Paul says that "the power [the earthly ruler, or king] . . . is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. 13:3-4), King John may have this portion of Scripture in mind when he speaks of himself as "God's wrathful agent" (II:i:87). There is also a possible indirect reference to the Scriptures in III:iii:8, when he speaks of "imprisoned angels set at liberty." Without doubt he is making

direct reference to coins called angels, coins which have been hoarded by the Romish-controlled institutions in England; this money John is determined to have freed for patriotic, or nationalistic, purposes. Nevertheless, "imprisoned angels" may be a pun³ upon the scriptural teaching that "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved [imprisoned] in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6).

From Pandolph, the Cardinal, we might expect references to be made to the Scriptures, but we can find none, unless we include what may be behind his arguments on the divine right theory.

Cursing Constance is the character who makes most use of the Bible in this drama. Her first reference is in these words to Eleanor, her mother-in-law:

Thy sins are visited in this poor child [Arthur];
The canon of the law is laid on him,
Being but the second generation
Removed from thy sin-conceiving womb.

(II:i:179-82)

There is no question about her allusion here to Exodus 20:5: "I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." Thus "the canon of the law" is this rule of the Mosaic teaching that sin shall be visited to the third and fourth generations; and since Arthur is but two generations re-

moved from his grandmother Eleanor, Constance cites this passage as to the point. Constance may have woven into this speech reference to another Scripture: "thy sin-conceiving womb" may have been spoken with a knowledge of Psalm 51:5: "In sin did my mother conceive me."

In his affliction the patriarch Job cried: "Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night in which it was said, 'There is a man child conceived'" (Job 3:3). When King Philip says that "this blessed day [the day of the marriage of Lewis to Blanch] / Ever in France shall be kept festival" (III:i:75-76), in bitterness Constance approximates the words of Job with her reply; she says: "Nay, rather turn this day out of the week,⁴ / This day of shame, oppression, perjury" (lines 87-88). Then, in the same tone of lamentation, she continues, "Let wives with child / Pray that their burdens may not fall this day" (lines 89-90).⁵ Although the language here is not identical, and the figure is slightly altered, she may be expressing the woe/^{which is}to accompany that great period of tribulation prophesied by Christ in Matthew 24:19-20: "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day."

As the Bible speaks of the devil as "the tempter" (Mat. 4:1-3), so Constance says, "The devil tempts thee" (III:i:208). She must have known the Biblical account concerning Cain to be able to say: "For since the birth of Cain, the first male child, /

. . . There was not such a gracious creature born" (III:iv:79,81).⁶
 And, finally, she speaks of the resurrection: "So he'll [Arthur] die; and, rising so again, . . . I shall meet him in the court of heaven" (III:iv:86-87).

In this play of King John there are three possible references to Joshua's long day, described in the Bible thus:

Then spake Joshua to the LORD in the day when the LORD delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon." And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies.

(Joshua 10:12-13)

First, King Philip says: "To solemnize this day the glorious sun / Stays in his course⁷ and plays the alchemist" (III:i:77-78); and Constance replies: "If it must stand still, let wives with child / Pray that their burdens may not fall this day" (lines 89-90). What Philip considered as a great victory, Constance declaimed as a great tragedy. Then as Lewis reports his victory over the English forces, unmistakably he thinks of Joshua's phenomenon, as he says:

The sun of heaven methought was loath to set,⁸
 But stay'd⁹ and made the western welkin blush,
 When English measure backward their own ground
 In faint retire.¹⁰

(V:v:1-4)

Bishop Wordsworth calls our attention to the following passage uttered by the Bastard:

For your own ladies and pale-visag'd maids
 Like Amazons come tripping after drums,

Their thimbles into armed gauntlets change,
 Their needles to lances, and their gentle hearts
 To fierce and bloody inclination.

(V:ii:154-58)

Wordsworth refers to this portion in proof of his contention that the Bible influenced Shakespeare's poetry.¹¹ He refers in particular to "thimbles [being changed] into armed gauntlets" and "needles to lances." The allusion to Joel 3:10 seems to be clear enough, for there the prophet admonishes the Gentiles to prepare for war, to "beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears: let the weak say, 'I am strong.'"

The Bastard also makes other interesting utterances. He refers to "Prince Lucifer" (IV:iii:122). Whether or not Lucifer is another scriptural title for Satan is a matter of debate, but we pause here to call attention to the possible allusion. When the Bastard said to Salisbury, "Put up thy sword" (IV:iii:98), we cannot say that he was quoting Scripture, but we can say that the expression is word for word the same as Christ's utterance to Peter: "Put up thy sword" (John 18:11). After a similar fashion Lady Falconbridge approximates the phrasing of Scripture. She cried: "Heaven lay not my transgression to my charge" (I:i:256); and these words remind us definitely of the cry of the dying Stephen: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts 7:60). And it may have been with knowledge of the beam and the mote (Mat. 7:3-5) that the following passage was written:

Arthur. Is there no remedy?

Hubert. None, but to lose your eyes.

Arth. O heaven, that there were but a mote¹² in yours.

(IV:i:91-92)

In dealing with the Scriptures in King John, our last reference is to an utterance by Blanch. As the Bible repeatedly associates impending judgment with the changes in the sun and moon,¹³ so she says, "The sun's o'ercast with blood" (III:i:326). True, here she speaks of the sun rather than the moon appearing as blood, but it is quite easy for Shakespeare so to contract this passage as to suppress "the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood" (Joel 2:31) to read: "The sun's o'ercast with blood."

VIII

THE SCRIPTURES IN HENRY VIII

Like most of Shakespeare's late dramas, Henry VIII is rather barren of Biblical material, even though it is quite a religious play.¹ Theodore Spencer thinks that Shakespeare, having passed through a period of mental turmoil during which his great tragedies were written, came into a new experience of hope, as reflected by such plays as A Winter's Tale and The Tempest.² But did he, during this interval, lose his zeal and enthusiasm for the Bible? While we are not prepared to determine the answer to that question, we can say with certainty that his last-written plays are outstanding for their dearth of scriptural allusions. And as we deal with the speeches of the following characters, we are conscious that it is doubtful if some of them have any actual relationship to Scripture.

We can find King Henry VIII making but two allusions to Scripture. The first concerns the trial of Jesus, as follows:

At what ease
Might corrupt minds procure knaves as corrupt
To swear against you? Such things have been done.
You are potently oppos'd, and with a malice
Of as great size. Ween you of better luck,
I mean, in perjur'd witness, than your Master,
Whose minister you are, whiles here He liv'd
Upon this naughty earth?

(V:i:131-38)

The enemies of the Archbishop Cranmer, like the enemies of Christ (Mark 14:1, 55-59), have risen against him and plotted a false trial.

These circumstances give King Henry the occasion for uttering the lines just quoted. The second reference King Henry makes to the Bible is slight, even doubtful; it is where he calls God "my Maker" (V:v:69), as did Elihu in Job 35:10: "Where is God my maker?"

We should expect the Archbishop of Canterbury not only to be versed in the Bible but also to reveal this knowledge. Yet, strangely enough, in Henry VIII we find him making but few references to Scripture. To his enemies he says:

I do beseech your lordships,
That, in this case of justice, my accusers,
Be what they will, may stand forth face to face,
And freely urge against me.

(V:iii:45-48)

Here the Archbishop is pleading for the right to meet his "accusers . . . face to face"; and these very words may well have been drawn from a knowledge of Festus' words to the enemies of Paul: "'To whom I answered, "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face,"³ and have licence to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."'" (Acts 25:16).

Next, we find him saying that

Saba [queen of Sheba] was never
More covetous of wisdom and fair virtue
Than this pure soul shall be.

(V:v:24-26)

In this speech Cranmer is speaking prophetically of the baby Eliza-

beth (the future Queen Elizabeth I), and he is here saying that her search for wisdom will compare with that quest made by the Queen of Sheba, who journeyed to Jerusalem to hear the wisdom of Solomon (1 Kings 10:1-10).⁴

At the christening of baby Elizabeth, Cranmer makes a prophecy as to the greatness of this child when she comes to the English throne, as follows:

In her days every man shall eat in safety
Under his own vine what he plants, and sing
The merry songs of peace to all his neighbours.
God shall be truly known.

(V:v:34-37)

What the Archbishop is doing in this prophecy is predicting that during the reign of Queen Elizabeth conditions will compare with those predicted for the golden age of Christ's coming earth-rule, commonly called the Millennium. The prophet Micah speaks of this period of peace and prosperity thus: "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the LORD of hosts hath spoken it. For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the LORD our God for ever and ever" (Micah 4: 4-5). It is quite evident that Cranmer has this Scripture in mind as he speaks the lines already quoted.

We should also look for Cardinal Wolsey to quote the Scriptures in one way or another, nevertheless we find him making only two or three allusions to the Bible; but since two of these concern

matters we have previously dealt with--man's being created in God's image⁵ and Jesus' words "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you" (Mat. 5:44)⁶--we shall merely quote the Cardinal's allusions here: "Man . . . / The image of his Maker" (III:ii:441-42), and "Cherish these hearts that hate thee" (III:ii:443). His most significant utterance that alludes to the Bible is his statement about the fall of Lucifer:

And when he falls, he falls like Lucifer,
Never to hope again.

.
Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition!
By that sin fell the angels; how can man, then,
The image of his Maker, hope to win by it?

(III:ii:371-72, 440-42)

The Old Testament portion which tells how, through pride and ambition, Lucifer fell and thus became Satan, is Isaiah 14:12-14:

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, 'I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.'"

When counselling Timothy not to select a new convert to be a bishop, the Apostle Paul evidently had this Old Testament passage in mind, for he wrote: "[A bishop must] not [be] a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6). These two Scriptures are likely behind Wolsey's words.

It may be of interest to note that Shakespeare does not make Wolsey quote Scripture until first the Cardinal has lost his position and become repentant.

The third chapter of Daniel gives us the account of Nebuchadnezzar's command that his servants "should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heated" (v. 19); but when the soldiers threw the three Hebrews into the furnace, "the flames of the fire slew those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego" (v. 22). Possibly Norfolk is referring to this event when he says:

Be advis'd;
Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot
That it do singe yourself.

(I:i:139-41)

Although Norfolk applies his words to Henry VIII and the Apostle Paul applies his to God, there is such a marked similarity of phraseology between the two following passages that the second may be indebted to the first:

Paul. Hath not the potter power over the clay,
of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour,
and another unto dishonour?

(Romans 9:21)

Norfolk. All men's honours
Lie like one lump before him, to be fashioned
Into what pitch he please.

(II:ii:48-50)

Maybe such comparisons are farfetched; perhaps the similarity is purely coincidental; yet we call attention to them here lest some

critic think that these comparisons are justified and should not be overlooked or ignored.

Suffolk must have been acquainted with the truth of Prov. 26:27. That Scripture verse reads: "He that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him"; and Suffolk said:

'Tis the right ring, by heaven! I told ye all,
When we first put this dang'rous stone a-rolling,
'Twould fall upon ourselves.

(V:iii:103-5)

The Porter, being unable to keep back the crowds pressing for a glimpse of the baby Elizabeth, defends his failure by saying, "I am not Samson . . . / To mow 'em down before me" (V:iv:22-23). Doubtless he must be credited with thinking of the supernatural strength which the Bible associates with this ancient judge of Israel (Judges 13-16); but more than that, when the Porter speaks of mowing down enemies, he may be thinking expressly of these words: "He [Samson] smote them hip and thigh with a great slaughter" (Judges 15:8).

The last two passages with which we deal are questionable indeed, so far as their relationship to the Bible is concerned. The Old Lady attending Anne Bullen says, "Our content / Is our best having" (II:iii:22-23). Easily enough this statement could have been based upon some current proverb; yet it is similar to the Apostle Paul's teaching found in 1 Timothy 6:6: "Godliness with contentment is great gain." Katherine speaks of "Simony" (IV:ii:36). This term owes its origin to the readiness of Simon Magus to

traffic in sacred things, as related in Acts 8:9-24; whether or not Katherine can be credited with knowing the scriptural origin of the term is open to doubt; but, in part, the Scripture account is this:

There was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, "This man is the great power of God." And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries. . . . And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hand, he may receive the Holy Ghost."

(Acts 8:9-11, 18-19)

We have now completed our play-by-play study of the historical dramas of Shakespeare insofar as they show his familiarity with the Scriptures and his inclusion of them--knowingly and unknowingly--in these works.

CONCLUSION

The investigation we have now carried out into the historical plays of Shakespeare reveals that a considerable number of references are made to the Scriptures. That the dramatist was acquainted with some Bible passages evokes no wonderment, but that he should have woven so many into his plays may be somewhat surprising. By way of conclusion, it may be well for us to summarize briefly what this material seems to tell us as to the source of Shakespeare's familiarity with the Scriptures, the manner in which he quotes them, and the portions which are recurrent in these dramas.

In the Introduction we have already noted the ready access Shakespeare had to the English versions of the Scriptures; but did he actually avail himself of this opportunity for private study? The knowledge he could have gained from general conversation, secular reading, and hearing sermons and Bible readings at divine services hardly seems adequate to account for the detailed and apt use he made of Scripture.

Let us take some of the allusions to the account of Adam and Eve as an example of Shakespeare's thorough acquaintance with that portion of the Bible. Prince Hal spoke of "the old days of goodman Adam" (1 Hen. IV II:iv:105-6), and the Queen, in Richard II, thought of him and his pristine responsibility when she addressed the gardener as "Thou, old Adam's likeness, set to dress this

garden" (III:iv:73). Then she immediately, under the stress of the occasion, linked Adam with his first transgression thus:

What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee
To make a second fall of cursed man?

(Richard II III:iv:75-76)

Here Shakespeare has packed two lines with compressed Biblical history. References are made to the fall,¹ to the woman's part and the serpent's (Satan's) part in that event, to the fact that it was through Eve that Satan tempted Adam, and to the penalty, the resultant curse upon man.² Falstaff, too, refers to this account when he says:

Dost thou hear, Hal? Thou know'st in
the state of innocency Adam fell; and what should
poor Jack Falstaff do in the days of villany?

(1 Hen. IV III:iii:185-87)

The detail in which Shakespeare has related this one brief Bible story would seem to give evidence that he must have diligently studied the account for himself. On this point Richmond Noble remarks:

It is only when we assemble all the references to Adam and Eve that we realize how intimately he [Shakespeare] knew that narrative; . . . when they are gathered together, it is borne in on the collector that there is hardly a phase of the story as narrated in the first three chapters of Genesis that has been missed.

.

His reading of Genesis is still more apparent when we read Shylock's "What says that fool of Hagar's offspring?" with reference to his former servant Launcelot, whom, as Sarah did Ishmael, he suspects

of mocking him. From hearing the chapter read, no one would gather the incident in all its significance, to say nothing of the perfect aptness of Shylock's allusion in view of all the circumstances.

But the matter is clinched finally, and all doubts of Shakespeare's having read Genesis are dissipated when we come to Shylock's account of the deal between Laban and Jacob. The deal is not free from complications, but Shakespeare gets it accurately. Not only does Shylock add the concluding verse of the chapter as to the blessing that attended Jacob, but Antonio refers to the succeeding chapter. The man who had only heard the story read might have a vague idea of one chapter, but he would not know the next.³

There is not only the detailed use that Shakespeare makes of Scripture, but also the aptness with which he brings in Biblical allusions. This characteristic is seen in passages like the one Noble refers to in The Merchant of Venice, yet it is more striking when we find it in such obscure places as are likely to escape our notice altogether. Sprague notes that

Shakespeare is so familiar with the Bible that we who know less of the sacred Book are sometimes slow to catch his allusions.⁴

As an illustration of this statement, we call attention to the fact that it requires more than casual reading and acquaintance with the Bible--and Shakespeare--to detect the dramatist's masterly skill in weaving the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus and the Twenty-Third Psalm into the Hostess' report of Falstaff's death, as we noted when studying this passage in Henry V II:iii:5-18.⁵

Once in a while Shakespeare closely follows the wording of Scripture, as "Blessed are the peacemakers on earth"⁶ and "Woe

to that land that's govern'd by a child!"⁷ But seldom do his characters quote the Scriptures verbatim; even when specific allusions are made to Bible portions, "'Come, little ones'"⁸ is quoted for "Suffer the little children to come unto me";⁹ and "'It is as hard to come as for a camel / To thread the postern of a small needle's eye'"¹⁰ is given for "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."¹¹ Albeit, such loose quotations are "in character." We might expect the Bible to be quoted word-for-word by a clergyman; yet unless it was a very familiar and oft-repeated passage, we should not expect the common man to quote Scripture verbatim.

Sometimes, however, in rewording Scripture, Shakespeare clarifies its meaning. Certainly "Thou shalt do no murder"¹² better interprets the sense of the Fifth Commandment than "Thou shalt not kill."¹³ And--if we may be permitted here to bring in another passage outside the historical plays--Shakespeare at times gives to the Bible quotations a new and rich meaning, poetically descriptive, as, for example, when he speaks of God catering for the sparrow rather than feeding¹⁴ it:

Adam. He that doth the ravens feed,
Yea, providently caters for the sparrow,
Be comfort to my age!

(As You Like It II:iii:43-45)

During the course of our study, we have been careful to note Shakespeare's recurrent use of certain Scriptures, such as the ac-

counts of sheep and wolves, the prodigal son, the rich man and Lazarus, Pilate's hand-washing, etc. Why these portions are repeated we cannot say with any certainty, yet they are repeated. And while it is not within the scope of this thesis to relate Biblical quotation to character, we should like to hint that the absence of Scripture on the lips of some unscrupulous prelates, the advantageous quotation of Scripture by a hypocrite like Richard III, and the frequent and apt quotations of the Bible by a conscience-troubled profligate like Falstaff are all significant. Pilate's hand-washing may have deeply impressed Shakespeare from a religious standpoint, or, on the other hand, he may have seen in it a dramatic stage effect--a man trying to cleanse his hands of human blood. Our calling attention to such recurrences of Scripture may stimulate some reader to delve into the deeper significance of such repetitions.

With a quotation from T. R. Eaton, we may well conclude this thesis on Shakespeare's Use of the Scriptures:

Shakespeare perpetually reminds us of the Bible; not by direct quotation, indirect allusion, borrowed idioms, or palpable imitation of phrase and style, but by an elevation of thought and simplicity of diction which are not to be found elsewhere. A passage, for instance, rises in our thoughts, unaccompanied by a clear recollection of its origin. Our first impression is, that it must belong either to the Bible or Shakespeare. No other author excites the same feeling in an equal degree.¹⁵

FOOTNOTES

Introduction

¹ The Moral System of Shakespeare, pp. 1-2.

² Likely date, 1613.

³ Had this comparison not been made, we could not be sure of Shakespeare's references, as he had not the A. V. before him. Furthermore, had the Bishops' Bible been consistently quoted, we would have felt obligated to use its chapter and verse identification, which varies sufficiently from the A. V. to confuse modern readers; the Geneva Bible, while older than the Bishops', compares favourably with the A. V. with respect to chapter and verse divisions.

⁴ The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare.

Chapter I--"Richard II"

¹ For this summary, see Appendix, p. 137.

² Daniel 10:3, 21; 12:1.

³ Geneva: "the childe of perdition"; Bishops': "that lost childe."

⁴ Perhaps Shakespeare's figure of man being modeled out of earth has come from the word made (Geneva), or, better still, shaped (Bishops').

⁵ Geneva: "rase me out"; Bishops': "wipe me . . . out."

⁶ Geneva: "put out"; Bishops': "do out."

⁷ Geneva: "put out"; Bishops': "wiped out."

⁸ Geneva: "put out."

⁹ Richard II IV:i:239-42; V:vi:49-50; Macbeth II:ii:59-63; V:i:31-59; cf. Henry V IV:vii:111-13; Richard III I:iv:279-80.

¹⁰ Rev. 21:1: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."

11 The Bible speaks of five such crowns: (1) an incorruptible crown (1 Cor. 9:25); (2) a crown of rejoicing (1 Thes. 2:19); (3) a crown of righteousness (2 Tim. 4:8); (4) a crown of life (Jas. 1:12; Rev. 2:10); and (5) a crown of glory (1 Pet. 5:4).

12 When he mentioned God's having heavenly armies ready to fight against the king's enemies in defence of the crown (III:ii:60-62; III:iii:85-87), he spoke of retribution.

13 Here Shakespeare came nearer the Geneva than the Bishops' Bible, as the former reads: "little children"; the latter, "yong children."

14 It is rather interesting to note that Shakespeare referred to two passages so close to each other in the same chapter of the Bible; this fact may witness to his having read this chapter near the time he penned these lines.

15 Shakespeare seems to have had a habit of condensing Scripture, by taking the first part of a passage and linking it with the latter part, omitting the portion in between. Maybe he was justified in doing this, but it does render the verse in the Bible in a somewhat different sense. A couple of instances of this are: Prov. 16:18, where "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" is shortened to read: "Pride must have a fall." Again we find Joel 2:31 reading: "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood"; but, if Shakespeare is alluding to this passage in John III:i:326, he reduces it to read: "The sun's o'ercast with blood."

16 The writer calls it fratricide from the very fact that as Cain was guilty of slaying his brother, the implication here seems to be that Mowbray was close enough to Gloucester to be guilty of the same crime.

17 Luke 16:22: "It came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Abraham's bosom, or the bosom of Abraham, is used by Shakespeare as a name for the abode of the righteous dead; however, in the light of its Biblical context, the expression seems to mean no more than that in their place of bliss Lazarus was being held against Abraham's breast. On "Abraham's bosome," the Geneva Bible has this marginal note: "As the Fathers in the olde Law were said to be gathered into the bosome of Abraham, because they received the fruit of the same faith with him: so in the new Testament we say that the members of Christ are joyned to their head, or gathered unto him." If by "the olde Law" the Old Testament is meant, we can find no passage to substantiate the claim that "the Fathers . . . were said to be gathered into the bosome of Abraham." A second Genevan marginal note on this same

expression, "the beggar . . . was carried . . . into Abrahams bosome," is as follows: "Whereby is signified that most blessed life, which they that die in the faith that Abraham did, shall enjoy after this world."

18 Henry V II:iii:9-10; Richard II IV:iii:38

19 Gen. 4:1-16.

20 I:i:104 and V:vi:43.

21 Cf. Mat. 27:24 with IV:i:239-42. See Footnote 9 on p. 124.

22 The only effectual washing of sin in the Bible is the blood of Christ's substitutionary atonement. E.g.: "This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. . . . and without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:20, 22); "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. 1:5); "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7); and, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Mat. 26:38).

23 To Prince Hal (soon to become King Henry V), the dying Henry IV said:

God knows, my son,
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met this crown.
.....
How I came by the crown, O God forgive.
.....
It hath been prophesi'd to me many years,
I should not die but in Jerusalem;
Which vainly I suppos'd the Holy Land.
But bear me to that chamber; there I'll lie;
In that Jerusalem shall Henry die.

(2 Henry IV IV:v:184-86, 219, 237-41)

24 A. W. Verity: "an immortal title; perhaps—a title of, i.e. claim to, immortality." Richard II, p. 98 of Notes.

25 Cf. this with Exodus 20:13 and 1 John 3:15.

26 Geneva: "Can the blacke Moze change his skin?"; Bishops': "May a man of Inde change his skin?"

27 Later Shakespeare expanded this thought, but put it--oddly enough--in the hypocritical mouth of the villainous Iago:

Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls.
Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something,
nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to
thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.

(Othello III:iii:155-61)

28 See pp. 15-16.

29 See 16, 21.

30 "The address and the adoration of Joshua, the holiness communicated to the spot by the presence of this Personage, and the application to him of the name Jehovah (ch. vi. 2), identify Him with the Angel of the Lord, the Second Person of the Trinity."--Dr. Robert Jamieson, Vol. II, p. 13. Dr. H. A. Ironside says: "The Captain of the Lord's host is, of course, none other than the Great Captain of our salvation: the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The angel of the covenant of the Old Testament is the Jesus of the New Testament, God manifest in flesh."--P. 63.

31 Geneva: "Prince"; Bishops': "captaine."

32 While the Bishops' Bible reads like the King James--"a place of a skull"--the Geneva reads: "the place of dead mens skulles." Hence, Shakespeare's associating "dead men's skulls" with Golgotha may well be attributed to his familiarity--here, at least--with the Geneva Bible.

33 Here again the Geneva reads: "dead mens skulles."

34 Geneva: "dead mens skuls"

35 On Shakspeare's Knowledge, etc., Chapter III, covering pp. 261-89. "I come now . . . to speak of passages in which Shakspeare has been indebted to Holy Writ, not only for poetical diction and sentiment, but for some of the most striking and sublime images which are to be found in his works."--Ibid., p. 261.

36 See Mark 7:24-30.

Chapter II--"1 Henry IV"

¹ The Variorum, p. 361, refers to Zachary Grey's Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Notes on Shakespeare, 1754, which cites Prov. 1:20, and also 8:1. Prov. 8:1-3 reads: "Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice? She standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths. She crieth in the gates, at the entry of the city, at the coming in at the doors."

² Cf. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; James 5:13.

³ Variorum, p. 139.

⁴ Variorum, p. 164: "STEEVENS (Var. ed. 1778): I am afraid here is a prophane allusion to the 33rd verse of the 12th chapter of St. Matthew." Mat. 12:33 reads: "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit."

⁵ Still another allusion is made by Falstaff to the Rich Man and Lazarus in 2 Henry IV I:ii:39-40.

⁶ The Variorum, p. 266, quotes Edgar I. Fripp, Shakespeare Studies, 1930, p. 144, as follows: "Elizabethan writers almost invariably speak of Dives as 'Glutton.'" The Variorum on 2 Henry IV, p. 57, says, quoting Samuel Burdett in Hemingway's 1921 edition: "The parable of Dives and Lazarus is frequently referred to by Falstaff, possibly because Dives . . . reminds Falstaff of his own manner of life and probable fate." "Two of Christ's parables, at least, have made an ineffaceable impression. Falstaff cannot forget them. They haunt his conscience. If Adam and his frailty are his excuse, the Prodigal Son and, still more, Dives the Glutton, are his reproach. . . . Falstaff is half afraid that he may be that Glutton and meet with his fate."--Edgar I. Fripp, Shakespeare Studies, 1930, pp. 143 f, as quoted in the Variorum on 2 Henry IV, p. 57.

⁷ As quoted in the Variorum, p. 268, from Carter's Shakespeare; Puritan and Recusant, 1897, p. 196.

Chapter III--"2 Henry IV"

¹ Variorum, p. 223.

² Richmond Noble, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge, p. 180. Noble has quoted the Bishops' Bible.

³ Ibid., p. 99.

⁴ The Variorum, p. 52, says that Thomas Carter "quotes Genesis ii. 7, Job xxxiii. 6, and Isaiah lxiv. 8 to illustrate the description of man as clay" (Shakespeare and Holy Scripture, 1905, p. 266).

⁵ These repeated references to the rich man and Lazarus constitute another case of the recurrence of scriptural ideas in Shakespeare's works.

⁶ Here Shakespeare follows the spelling in the Bishops' Bible, Achitophel; the Geneva reads Ahithophel.

⁷ "The poverty as well as the patience of Job is proverbial. Cf. Merry Wives V.v.149 [in Neilson and Hill edition, line 164]." --Variorum, p. 70.

⁸ This fact also adds to the mounting list of scriptural ideas recurrent in Shakespeare.

⁹ There is some uncertainty here about the text. While the Quarto reads "blind," the Folio reads "outbid." Neilson and Hill follow the Quarto. In Marlowe's Dr. Faustus, as noted above, the devil does outbid the good angel.

¹⁰ We are probably quite safe in identifying Satan as "the God of this world", even though the phrase appears only this once in the Bible; "the prince of this world" is an expression used by Christ twice (John 12:31; 14:30) as another name for the devil. On "the god of this world" the Geneva Bible carries this marginal note: "To wit, Satan. John 12.31, and 14.30. eph. 6.12."

¹¹ While the Variorum, p. 290, gives R. P. Cowl (ed. 1923) as thinking that "damn'd" is used "in the theological sense," it quotes Dr. Samuel Johnson (ed. 1765) on "she . . . burns poor souls" as follows: "Sir T. Hammer's reading [is] undoubtedly right, The venereal disease was called in these times the brennynge or burning." "So it was," comments Matthias A. Shaaber, "but the implication that burn means to suffer from venereal disease is incorrect; as COLLIER (ed. 1858) was the first to point out, burn means to infect with venereal disease."--Variorum, p. 290.

¹² "As the Psalmist saith" is the reading of the Quarto; the Folio omits the phrase entirely.

¹³ On Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible, p. 245.

Chapter IV--"Henry V"

¹ Job 1:6; 2:1; Eph. 2:2; 6:12, A.S.V.; Rev. 12:9; Job 1:7; 2:2; 1 Pet. 5:8.

² Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 615.

³ Webster's New International Dictionary (Second Ed.), under fall states: "lapse or declension from innocence or goodness; spiritual ruin; specif., the Fall, the first apostasy; the act of Adam and Eve in eating the forbidden fruit, often called the fall of man."

⁴ 1 Cor. 10:12: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." 1 Tim. 3:6-7: "[A bishop must] not [be] a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." 1 Tim. 6:9: "They that will be rich fall into temptation." Heb. 4:11: "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." James 1:2: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations." James 5:12: "My brethren, swear not, . . . lest ye fall into condemnation."

⁵ Perhaps the most remarkable passage in the New Testament referring to and dealing with the fall of man is that by the Apostle Paul in Romans 5:12-19; yet in it never once does he use the term fall.

⁶ The Genesis account of the fall reveals that Eve, not Adam, was deceived by Satan's temptation; Adam "fell" through deliberately choosing the lot of his "fallen" wife. Accordingly, the Apostle Paul wrote to Timothy: "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (1 Tim. 2:14).

⁷ Both the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles have a marginal note identifying leviathan as a whale.

⁸ See footnote on Abraham's bosom, under Richard II, Footnote 17, p. 125.

⁹ See Footnote 9 under Richard II for citations to hand-washing recurrences, p. 124.

Chapter V--"Henry VI, Parts 1, 2, and 3"

¹ If Shakespeare had this verse in mind when he penned the lines quoted above, then again he was influenced by the Geneva version rather than the Bishops', for the former uses the word mischiefe; the latter, travaile.

² Absalom died in his rebellion against King David, his father, although David requested leniency (2 Sam. 18:1-15); for cursing King David, Shimei was later executed because he failed to adhere to the provision made to spare his life (2 Sam. 16:5-12, cf. 1 Kgs. 2:8-9, 36-46); Athaliah was slain for conspiring against King Joash (2 Kings 11:1-16); all that conspired against King Amon were slain (2 Kgs. 21:23-24); etc.

³ The Divine Right of Kings, p. 6.

⁴ Ibid., p. 8, footnote.

⁵ See Appendix, p. 137.

⁶ The figure of sheep and wolves is another scriptural idea recurrent in Shakespeare's plays. See Footnotes 20 & 21 under Rich. III.

⁷ Ezra 9:15; Neh. 9:8; Job 22:3; Psa. 119:137; Jer. 12:1; etc.

⁸ 1 Sam. 1:11; Psa. 59:5; Jer. 11:20; Isa. 9:7; etc.

⁹ Evidently Gloucester associated Damascus with the place where Cain slew Abel. On this passage Neilson and Hill make a textual comment as follows: "Damascus: believed to have been the scene of the murder of Abel!"--p. 754.

¹⁰ Mat. 26:47-50; Mark 14:43-46; Luke 22:47-48; John 18:2-5.

¹¹ In Mat. 5:22 the Greek γέενναν (Gehenna) is translated hell; in Mat. 11:23, ᾗδου (Hades) is rendered hell; in 2 Pet. 2:4, ταρταρώσας (Tartarus) is given as hell; etc.

¹² This is another Scripture recurrent in Shakespeare. Cf. Measure for Measure V:i:416: "Like doth quit like, and Measure still for Measure."

¹³ The story of Jephthah and his daughter is another scriptural account recurrent in Shakespeare. Also see Hamlet II:ii:422-31.

Chapter VI--"Richard III"

¹ While the text of the Neilson and Hill edition follows the Folio here and renders this "by Saint John"; the Quarto gives it "by Saint Paul." Even in the Neilson and Hill edition "by Saint Paul" appears consistently elsewhere in Richard III. Furness says: "That the Qq is the correct reading may be seen by comparing where Paul appears consistently elsewhere" (Variorum, p. 39).

² I:ii:36, 41; iii:45; III:iv:78; V:iii:216.

³ 1 Tim. 6:15; Rev. 17:14; 19:16.

⁴ Cf. Antonio's remark: "The devil can cite Scripture for his own purpose" (Merchant of Venice I:iii:99).

⁵ To the mounting list of Shakespeare's recurrent use of certain Scriptures, we must add this example.

⁶ Shakespeare illustrates the same principle in the life of Macbeth, who thought one murder would establish him as king of Scotland; but no sooner had Duncan been slain than the two grooms must also perish; then there were Duncan's two sons who stood in Macbeth's way to the crown; next Banquo was a threat, and his son. Having yielded to one sin, Macbeth, too, soon learned "that sin will pluck on sin," or, to put it in his own words,

I am in blood
Stepp'd in so far that, should I wade no more,
Returning were as tedious as go o'er.

(Macbeth III:iv:136-38)

⁷ See Footnotes 17 & 18 under Richard II.

⁸ See 1 Sam. 24:6, 10; 26:9, 11, 16.

⁹ See the last paragraph on Queen Elizabeth under Richard III, p. 102.

¹⁰ Since Richard III did not reign until 1452, England had not yet become Protestant. But someone may argue that by that time the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory had not yet become a dogma of that Church, so Richard could not be expected to reveal a belief in it. While it had not yet become a dogma of the Roman Church, the idea of Purgatory was current, according to John Carrara, in his Catholicism Under the Searchlight of the Scriptures, p. 49:

Pope Gregory the Great, in the year 600 A.D., was the first to form the concept of purgatory as a third state in which souls could be purified before

entrance into heaven--an idea derived from Plato and Virgil. So we see it has a pagan origin. But even then it did not become a dogma of the Church of Rome until in 1459 [when] it was accepted by the Council of Florence, and confirmed by the Council of Trent in 1548.

11 Gen. 49:33; Job 10:18; 11:20; 14:10; Jer. 15:9; Mat. 27:50; Acts 5:10.

12 Neilson and Hill have followed the Quarto here. The Folio entirely omits "to have redemption / By Christ's dear blood shed for our grievous sins"; it simply reads: "I charge you, as you hope for any goodness." Malone says that the editors of the Folio arbitrarily omitted these words regarding redemption (see Variorum, p. 138).

13 1 Hen. IV I:i:24-27.

14 2 Hen. VI III:ii:154-55.

15 To be consistent, his should be spelled with a capital H; cf. the same expression rendered "His law" in line 205.

16 See Footnote 3 above under Richard III.

17 See Footnote 7 under Henry VI, Parts 1, 2, & 3.

18 Here the second king should be capitalized to recognize the Deity, thus: "the King's King."

19 As quoted in the Variorum, p. 165.

20 Cf. Mat. 7:15; 10:16; John 10:12; Acts 20:29.

21 Cf. 1 Henry VI I:iii:55; 2 Hen. VI III:i:77-78; 3 Hen. VI I:i:246.

22 The Variorum, p. 53, quotes W. A. Wright (Richard III, 1893) as saying: "There is probably a reference here to Numbers, xvi, 30."

23 Cf. Prov. 25:13: "snow in the time of harvest."

24 Richard II IV:i:239-42; V:vi:49-50; Henry V IV:vii:111-13; Macbeth II:ii:59-63; V:i:31-59.

25 Both Jesus and Stephen died praying for their murderers (Luke 23:34; Acts 7:59-60).

Chapter VII--"King John"

¹ Eleanor argues on behalf of her son John (II:i:122, 191-2); King Philip of France defends Arthur's claim (II:i:94-109, 152-53); while constantly backing John, the Bastard clearly recognizes Arthur's right (IV:iii:142-47), whose right Pembroke has already affirmed (IV:ii:96-100); and Pandolph contends for the Pope's right.

² See Appendix, "The Divine Right of Kings," p. 137.

³ Variorum, p. 238, quotes Miss Porter as saying: "This is, perhaps, a quip on imprisoned nuns quite as much as on the coins called 'angels.' The first pun would be understood by those who knew the older play [i.e., The Troublesome Reign of King John]."

⁴ Variorum, p. 180: "UPTON (Crit. Obs., ed. ii, p. 224): In allusion to Job, iii, 3: 'Let the day perish,' &c. And v. 6: 'Let it not be joined unto the days of the year, let it not come into the number of the months.'--[Other commentators, notably, Wordsworth, Carter, Eaton, and Wright, have called attention to the similarity in thought contained in these two passages.--ED.]."

⁵ However, if Constance is here referring to a passage like the one in Mat. 24:19-20, she has suddenly jumped from an Old Testament event associated with Joshua to a New Testament prophecy.

⁶ T. R. Eaton comments on this passage thus: "Could Constance better express, than by such allusion to Eve's first-born, how much her hopes had anchored upon her child, and how utterly these hopes were shipwrecked?"--Shakespeare and the Bible, p. 19.

⁷ Variorum, p. 179: "T. CARTER (Sh. & Holy Scrip., p. 207) compares for this idea . . . Joshua, x, 13."

⁸ "Loath to set" better expresses the Geneva than the King James Version. The idea of the sun lingering in the sky rather than standing still is seen in these words of Joshua 10:12, Geneva: "So the Sunne abode in the mids of the heaven, and hasted not to goe downe for a whole day."

⁹ The Geneva Bible uses stayed in Joshua 10:12--"Sunne, stay thou in Gibeon"--which rendering indicates the influence of this version on Shakespeare here. The Bishops' Bible is followed by the King James Version, as both render it stand.

¹⁰ Joshua's long day is, thus, another scriptural reference recurrent in Shakespeare.

¹¹ On Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible, p. 266.

¹² Variorum, p. 290: "UPTON (ed. ii, 252): Undoubtedly the true reading is, a mote, Matthew, vii, 3."

¹³ Joel 2:31: "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before the great and terrible day of the LORD come." Joel 3:14-16: "Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the LORD is near in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The LORD also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake." Isaiah 13:9-10: "Behold, the day of the LORD cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate: and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine." Matthew 24:29-30: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

Chapter VIII--"Henry VIII"

¹ Henry VIII abounds with religious terms, such as angels, Christian, devil, God, heaven, hell, prayer, sin, etc. But unless such terminology is accompanied by some additional Biblical detail, little knowledge of the Scripture is revealed. One may refer to the devil without understanding what the Bible teaches about Satan; however, when one says, for example, "He falls like Lucifer" (III:ii:371), or, "I am not a Samson" (V:iv:22)--meaning, I have not supernatural strength like this judge of Israel--it is a different matter; such usage of these terms reveals a knowledge of the Bible.

² Shakespeare and the Nature of Man, pp. 186-88: "In the tragedies the appearance may be good, but the reality . . . is evil. In the last plays the appearance may be evil, but the reality is invariably good. . . . For Shakespeare's later vision that grows out of an inner turmoil, is different from the first unthinking acceptance of youth. . . . It is significant that the gods in these last plays are repeatedly referred to as benevolent."

³ If Shakespeare were indebted to this Scripture for the idea of an indicted man having the right to meet his "accusers . . . face to face," he could not have had the Geneva version in mind, for it reads: "It is not the maner of the Romanes for favour to deliver any man to death, before that he which is accused have the accusers before him, and have place to defend himself concerning the crime." However, the Bishops' Bible has the phrase, "accusers face to face."

⁴ Also cf. 2 Chron. 9:1-12 and Mat. 12:42.

⁵ Richard III II:i:122-24.

⁶ Richard III I:ii:68-69; iii:335.

Conclusion

¹ King Henry V also makes an allusion to it, thus:

For this revolt of thine, methinks, is like
Another fall of man.

(Henry V II:ii:141-42)

² Gen. 3:17.

³ Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge, pp. 42-44.

⁴ Notes on "The Merchant of Venice," as quoted by Burgess, The Bible in Shakespeare, p. 32.

⁵ See p. 68.

⁶ 2 Henry VI II:i:35; cf. Mat. 5:9.

⁷ Richard III II:iii:11; cf. Eccl. 10:16.

⁸ Richard II V:v:15.

⁹ Mark 10:14.

¹⁰ Richard II V:v:16-17.

¹¹ Mark 10:25.

¹² Richard III I:iv:202.

¹³ Exodus 20:13. ¹⁴ Cf. Mat. 6:26. ¹⁵ Shakespeare and the Bible, pp. 12-13.

APPENDIX

The Divine Right of Kings

Since the theory of the divine right of kings plays such a prominent part in the thinking of many characters in Shakespeare's English historical dramas, it may be well for us to examine the idea in brief here. John Neville Figgis says:

The theory of the Divine Right of Kings in its completest form involves the following propositions:--

(1) Monarchy is a divinely ordained institution.

(2) Hereditary right is indefeasible. The succession to monarchy is regulated by the law of primogeniture. The right acquired by birth cannot be forfeited through any acts of usurpation, of however long continuance, by any incapacity in the heir, or by any act of deposition. So long as the heir lives, he is king by hereditary right, even though the usurping dynasty has reigned for a thousand years.

(3) Kings are accountable to God alone. Monarchy is pure, the sovereignty being entirely vested in the king, whose power is incapable of legal limitation. All law is a mere concession of his will, and all constitutional forms and assemblies exist entirely at his pleasure. He cannot limit or divide or alienate the sovereignty, so as in any way to prejudice the right of his successor to its complete exercise. A mixed or limited monarchy is a contradiction in terms.

(4) Non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined by God. Under any circumstances resistance to a king is a sin, and ensures damnation. Whenever the king issues a command directly contrary to God's law, God is to be obeyed rather than man, but the example of the primitive Christians is to be followed and all penalties attached to the breach of the law are to be patiently endured.¹

¹ The Divine Right of Kings, pp. 5-6.

As we are primarily concerned with Shakespeare's use of the Scriptures, we need to ponder the scripturalism of this theory. While Figgis has given us one of the best summaries of the concept as he has studied it in the light of history, to what extent can these four points quoted be supported by the Bible, and in what light does Shakespeare treat the subject in the English chronicle plays?

The first king mentioned in the Bible of whom it could be said that he reigned by divine right is Saul, the first king of the nation of Israel; yet the institution of his throne was more by God's consent than approval. God's choice form of human government seems to be a theocracy, which actually existed from the days of Moses (ca. 1500 B.C.) through the days of Samuel (ca. 1100 B.C.). During this four hundred year period, the Bible depicts Israel as being ruled directly from heaven through divine communications given to picked men, men selected for their qualities of spiritual leadership, not by any hereditary rights. Briefly, the circumstances surrounding the rise of a king over Israel are these:

Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life.

.....

And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, that he made his sons judges over Israel. . . . And his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment. Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him, "Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, "Give us a king to judge us." And Samuel prayed unto the LORD. And the

LORD said unto Samuel, "Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should reign over them."

(1 Samuel 7:15-8:7)

The details as to the choice of Saul as Israel's first king are given in the ninth chapter of 1 Samuel. Saul was "a choice young man, and a goodly: and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people" (v. 2). One day while he was in search for his father's lost asses, he stopped to inquire of the prophet Samuel. This inquiry, or meeting, was in fulfilment of the Lord's prediction: "To morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel" (v. 16). So, "when Samuel saw Saul, the LORD said unto him, 'Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people'" (v. 17). There Samuel anointed Saul, but later re-anointed him (chap. 10) in the eyes of the people. Thereafter, when David had several opportunities to injure, or even kill, Saul, David refused to do so on the ground that Saul was "the LORD's anointed."²

That "hereditary right is indefeasible" is more difficult to support from Scripture, especially as to the succession rights of the reigning king's oldest surviving son. David also was "the LORD's anointed" (1 Sam. 16:6), yet he was of another family than

² In the cave at En-gedi (1 Sam. 24), and in the wilderness of Ziph (1 Sam. 26).

Saul. David became the first king in a new dynasty. And although David's posterity reigned in unbroken succession until the time of the Babylonian captivity (ca. 586 B. C.), it was not always that the oldest living son succeeded his father, for Solomon followed David on Israel's throne, and he was not David's oldest son.

Naturally, those who believe that earthly monarchies exist in unbroken succession by divine right wish to find Biblical proof for this doctrine. However, the Bible seems to support the right of rulers on a broader view than this, namely, that any legitimately- or lawfully-established government should be obeyed for the sake of law and order. Perhaps the clearest exposition of this is given by the Apostle Paul as follows:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.³ For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.

(Romans 13:1-7)

³ "It was held of great importance to maintain that *xpōis* meant damnation in the strict sense" (Figgis, p. 8). But the Geneva, as well as later versions, rendered the word judgment (A.S.V.; R.S.V.).

The only scriptural grounds for Christians to refuse to obey the magistrates of the land is when obedience to man's laws conflicts with obedience to the higher laws of God. "Peter and John answered and said unto them, 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.' . . . Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, 'We ought to obey God rather than men'" (Acts 4:19; 5:29).

That lawful rulers rule by divine approval is clearly supported in the Scriptures, but the theory of the divine right of kings as outlined by Figgis is not so easily substantiated. In so far as rightfully-established kings reign without hindrance to their subjects' conscientious obedience to God, the laws of their kingdom are to be obeyed.

During the course of Shakespeare's historical dramas we find the various English monarchs claiming their divine right; yet when the parliamentary rights of the people were recognized, not always did the oldest son succeed his father, nor even the next in line by hereditary descent. However, when there was cause for dissatisfaction with the reigning monarch, always someone was ready to challenge the legitimacy of that king's rule; and at times the very person most responsible for the establishment of an "irregularly" reigning monarch would later turn against this ruler⁴ and try to de-

⁴ For examples of this vascillation we call attention to the Duke of York, who led the movement to make Bolingbroke king, and later fought against the established Henry VI; likewise, the Earl of Warwick, who so staunchly supported Edward IV's claim to the throne, renounced this monarch in support of Henry VI.

throne him as an unlawful king. So, often the idea of the divine right of kings was merely a theory to accept or reject according to the whims of the most powerful political party.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bishops Bible (1568). Imprinted at London by the Deputies of Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queens Most Excellent Majestie. Anno Domini, 1596.

Geneva Bible (1560). Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie. Anno Domini, 1611, for the Old Testament; 1610, for the New Testament.

King James Bible (1611). Oxford: at the University Press, N.D., but about 1935.

Neilson and Hill. The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, a New Text Edited with Introduction and Notes by Wm. A. Neilson and Chas. J. Hill. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Secondary Sources

- Burgess, William. The Bible in Shakspeare. Chicago: Winona Publishing Co., 1903.
- Carrara, John. Catholicism Under the Searchlight of the Scriptures. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House, 1943.
- Clelia (pseudonym for Charles Downing). God in Shakspeare. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1890.
- Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York: The Dryden Press, 1948.
- Collins, John Churton. Ephemera Critica or Plain Truths about Current Literature. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1901.
- Downing, Charles. See Clelia above.
- Eaton, T. R. Shakespeare and the Bible. London: James Blackwood, 1858.
- Figgis, John Neville. The Divine Right of Kings. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.
- Furness, Horace Howard, Jr. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare; The Life and Death of King John, edited by Furness. Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1919.
- . A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Richard the Third, edited by Furness. Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1908.
- Harbage, Alfred. As They Liked It, An Essay on Shakespeare and Morality. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.
- Hemingway, Samuel Burdett, editor. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Henry the Fourth, Part 1. Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1936.
- Ironside, H. A. Addresses on the Book of Joshua. New York: Loizeaux Bros., 1950.
- Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown. A Commentary, Critical, Experimental and Practical on the Old and New Testaments, by Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1945. In 6 vols.

- Johnson, Samuel. Johnson on Shakespeare, Essays and Notes Selected and Set Forth with an Introduction by Walter Raleigh. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Lowry, Oscar. Where Are the Dead? Chicago: Moody Press, 1945.
- Masefield, John. Shakespeare and Spiritual Life. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Moulton, Richard G. The Moral System of Shakespeare. New York: Macmillan Co., 1903.
- , Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist. Third ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
- ~~Neilson and Hill. The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, a New Text Edited with Introduction and Notes by Wm. A. Neilson and Chas. J. Hill. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942.~~
- Noble, Richmond. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge. New York: Macmillan Co., 1935.
- Santayana, George. Little Essays Drawn from the Writings of George Sanatayana by Logan Pearsall Smith, with the Collaboration of the Author. London: Constable & Co., 1920.
- Shaaber, Matthias A., editor. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Second Part of Henry the Fourth. Philadelphia:
- Spencer, Theodore. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York: Macmillan Co., 1943.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. The Great Poets and Their Theology. Philadelphia: American Baptist Pub. Society, 1897.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Corrected Edition. New York: American Book Co., 1889.
- Wordsworth, Charles. On Shakspeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1864.
- Variorum. For volumes used, see above under Furness, Hemingway, and Shaaber, editors of editions used.
- Verity, A. W., editor. Richard II. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.

Articles

- Battenhouse, R. W. "Measure for Measure and Christian Doctrine of the Atonement," Modern Language Association Publications, Vol. 61 (1946).
- Brook, F. H. C. "Oedipus, Macbeth, and the Christian Tradition," Contemporary Review, March (1950).
- Hankins, John E. "Lear and the Psalmist," Modern Language Notes, Vol. 61 (1946).
- Lloyd R. "Rack of This Tough World: Comparison of King Lear and the Gospel Narrative," Quarterly Review, Oct. (1947).
- Myrick, Kenneth O. "The Theme of Damnation in Shakespearean Tragedy," Studies in Philology, Vol. 38, April (1941).
- Pope, E. M. "Shakespeare on Hell," Shakespeare Quarterly, July (1950).
- Seaton, Ethel. "Antony and Cleopatra and the Book of Revelation," Review of English Studies, Vol. 22, July (1946).
- Webb, C. C. J. "Shakespeare and Religion," Hibbert Journal, Vol. 26, Jan. (1928).

Books, Pamphlets, and Articles

Not Available to the Author,

Yet Which May Contain Material Bearing on the Subject

- Anders, H. R. D. "The Bible and the Prayer Book," Shakespeare's Books. Berlin: 1904.
- B---- (C. A. H.). "Shakespeare's Debt to the Bible," Our Own Fireside. London: 1864. A copy is in the Boston Public Library.
- Barry, Wm. "The Catholic Strain in Shakespeare," A Book of Homage to Shakespeare, ed. by Israel Gollanaz. London: 1916.
- Beeching, H. C. "On the Religion of Shakespeare," Shakespeare's Works in 10 vols. Stratford: The Stratford Town Ed., 1904-07. The article contains a review of all opinions on the subject up to 1907.
- Bowden, Henry S. The Religion of Shakespeare, Chiefly from the writings of the late Mr. Richard Simpson. London: 1899. Regards Shakespeare as a Catholic.

- Brown, J. Bible Truths with Shakespearean Parallels. London: Whittaker, 1862. Selections from Scripture with passages illustrative of the text, from Shakespeare. A copy is in the Boston Public Library. Other copies are at the British Museum, Birmingham Public Library, and Cambridge Public Lib.
- Bullock, Charles. Shakespeare's Debt to the Bible. 1879. Copies in the British Museum, Birmingham Pub. Lib., and Boston Pub. Lib.
- Carter, Thomas. Shakespeare and Holy Scripture with the Version He Used, i.e., The Genevan Bible. London: 1905.
- Chrisman, L. H. "Macbeth: a Study in Sin and Retribution," Methodist Review, Vol. 113, Nov. (1930).
- Colton, Gardner Q. Shakespeare and the Bible. New York: Knox & Co., 1888. Parallel passages and passages suggested by the Bible, with religious sentiments of Shakespeare. Copies in the British Museum and Boston Pub. Lib.
- Dinsmore, C. A. "Shakespeare: What He Admired and What He Believed," Great Poets and the Meaning of Life.
- Goodson, H. F. Shakespeare: His Religious and Moral Sentiments. London: Simpkin, 1874. Gems gathered from his writings. Copies in the British Museum and Boston Pub. Lib.
- Fripp (it may be Tripp), E. I. "The Religion of Shakespeare's Father," Hibbert Journal, Vol. 26 (1928)
- Grant, P. S. "Religion of Shakespeare," Essays.
- Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Ideal Man. Answers Santayana's claim of "absence of religion" in Shakespeare, which Mazzini claimed before him.
- Harrison, G. B. "Shakespeare's Religion," Commonweal, Vol. 48, July (1948).
- Hichner, Max. "Shakespeare's Conception of the Clergy," Shakespeare Association Bulletin, Vol. 11, July (1936).
- James, J. C. "Religion in Shakespeare," London Quarterly Review, Vol. 155, April (1931).
- Kellett, E. E. "Macbeth and Satan," London Quarterly Review, Vol. 164, July (1939).

- Lavater, Ludwig. "Of Ghostes and Spirites Walking by Nyght" (1572). Edited with introduction and appendix by J. Dover Wilson and Mary Yardley. Oxford: for the Shakespeare Association, Vol. 31, (1929). Introduction: J. Dover Wilson: "The Ghost-Scenes in Hamlet in the Light of Elizabethan Spiritualism."
- Law, R. A. "Shakespeare in the Garden of Eden," University of Texas Studies in English.
- Lees, F. N. "A Biblical Connotation in Macbeth," Notes and Queries, Vol. 9, Dec. 9 (1950).
- Malcolm, W. H. Shakespeare and Holy Writ. London: Marcus Ward Co., 1881. Parallel passages, tabularly arranged. Copies in the British Museum, Birmingham Pub. Lib., and Shakespeare Memorial Library.
- Morton, Richard K. "The Faith of Shakespeare," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 89, July (1932).
- Plumptre, C. J. Religion and Morality of Shakespeare's Works (1873).
- Proctor, W. C. Shakespeare and Scripture. London: 1929.
- Russell, A. J. "Shakespeare," Their Religion.
- Santayana, George. "Absence of Religion in Shakespeare," Interpretations of Poetry and Religion.
- Scott, Reginald. The Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584). Ed. by B. Nicholson, 1886. Reprinted from ed. of 1584 with introduction by Montague Summers. London: 1930.
- Sharp, Prof. Frank C. Shakspeare's Portrayal of Moral Life. New York: 1902.
- Spalding, Thos. A. "Elizabethan Demonology," an essay in illustration of the belief in the existence of devils, with special reference to Shakespeare and his works. London: 1880.
- Sprague. Notes on "The Merchant of Venice."
- Tripp (see Fripp above).
- Wallace, A. "Religious Faith of Great Poets," Religious Faith of Great Men.
- Weber, Carl J. "On Shakspeare's Biblical Knowledge," Shakespeare Association Bulletin, Vol. 11, July (1936).

B29774